DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 532 CE 053 771

AUTHOR Willette, JoAnne; And Others
TITLE Estimates and Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training.
INSTITUTION Decision Demographics, Washington, DC.; Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Assessment of Vocational Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 88
CONTRACT 300-87-0123
NOTE 144p.; For related documents, see ED 283 020, ED 290 881, ED 299 412, ED 297 150, CE 053 752-774, and CE 053 783-797.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Adult Basic Education; *Bilingual Education Programs; Case Studies; English (Second Language); Immigrants; *Labor Force Development; Language Proficiency; *Limited English Speaking; *Population Trends; Social Services; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

A study estimated the size of the population of adults and out-of-school youth with limited English proficiency (LEP) who need vocational education and related employment services and projected the size of this population from the time of the study to the year 2000. Research procedures included a literature review, an analysis of 1980 U.S. census data, and projections of the population. Two measures, constructed from census data to assist in the analysis, were used to categorize individuals as either limited English-proficient or as English-proficient and also to categorize them by poverty status. The following are among the findings reported: (1) the flow of immigrants has grown steadily since 1965 until now it is almost as high as it was in the 1900s, with the most recent immigrants being less educated and skilled than those who entered 15-20 years ago; (2) the number of persons with LEP aged 16-64 was estimated to be 6.8 million in 1980, which is about 4 percent of the U.S. population; (3) their number is projected to be 11.6 million by 1990 and about 17.4 million by 2000; (4) a projected 5.5 million could require services in 1990 and 8 million could need them by 2000; (5) over half of the adults with LEP speak Spanish; (6) the likelihood of becoming proficient in English is highest within 10 years after arriving in the United States; and (7) over 70 percent of the adults with LEP living below the poverty level in 2000 will be Hispanics. (The document contains 59 tables and 46 references.) (CML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315532

ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION IN NEED OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

JoAnne Willette

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

Carl Haub
Stephen Tordella

DECISION DEMOGRAPHICS
777 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Submitted to:
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

October 1988

CG 23 771

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This document was prepared under Contract No. 300-87-0123 with the U.S. Department of Education. The opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of the Department, and no official endorsement by the Department of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Background	1
	1. Trends in U.S. Immigration Since 1965	2
	2. Economic Assimilation	9
	B. Summary	18
II.	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION IN NEED OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING	20
	A. Procedures	20
	1. The Measure of English Proficiency	21
	2. The Poverty Status Measure	23
	B. Description of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population	26
	1. Poverty Status, Sex, and Age	26
	2. Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin	27
	3. Geographic Distribution and Urbanicity	30
	4. Year of Immigration and Citizenship	32
	5. Education	33
	6. Labor Force Status	34
	7. Household Type	37
	8. Family Income and Earned Income	40
	9. Public Assistance	41
	10. Total Hours Worked in 1979	41
	11. Characteristics of Native Born Limited English Proficient Adults	42
	C. Summary	44
III.	PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION TO THE YEAR 2000	47
	A. Projection Procedures	47
	B. Base Population	48
	C. Projection Components	49
	1. Ferlitity	51
	2. Mortality	51
	3. Immigration	52

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

		Page
	D. Projection Results	54
	E. Reduction of the Limited English Proficient Population by Attainment of English Proficient	54
	F. Summary	60
IV.	PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION IN NEED OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING: 1990 AND 2000	62
	A. Procedures	62
	B. Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training and Related Services	65
	1. Poverty Status, Sex, and Age	65
	2. Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin	66
	3. Geographic Distribution	67
	4. Education	68
	5. Labor Force Status	69
	6. Household Type	70
	7. Preparation for Workforce 2000	70
	C. Summary	71
REFERENCES		72
APPENDICES:		75
Appendix A.	Characteristics of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population - Tables	75
Appendix B.	Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population - Tables	94
Appendix C.	Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population by Poverty Status: 1980, 1990, and 2000 - Tables	100

TABLES

Table No.		Page
1.1	Percentage of Legal Immigrants by Region of Last Residence: 1921-1985	3
1.2	Legal Immigration from 1976 to 1985	5
1.3	States with the Highest Number of Foreign Born: 1980 Census	16
2.1	Estimated Poverty Level Incomes and Their Relationship to the National Median Family Income for 1979	25
2.2	Median Age of Limited English and English Proficient Adults by Poverty Status: 1980	27
2.3	Racial/Ethnic Groups Ranked by Percentage of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population: 1980	28
2.4	Limited English Proficient Adult Population by Percentage of Racial/Ethnic Group Living Below 1.25 of Poverty: 1980	29
2.5	Percentages of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Adults in Each Racial/Ethnic Category Below 1.25 of Poverty: 1980	31
2.6	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Adults by Geographic Region: 1980	31
2.7	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Adults Below 1.25 of Poverty by Geographic Region: 1980	32
2.8	Percentage of Limited English Proficient Adults Below 1.25 of Poverty by Year of Immigration: 1980	33
2.9	Median Educational Level of Limited English and English Proficient Adults by Poverty Status: 1980	34
2.10	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Males, Ages 16-64, by Labor Force Status: 1980	35
2.11	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Males, Ages 16-64, by Labor Force Status and Poverty Status: 1980	36
2.12	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Females, Ages 16-64, by Labor Force Status: 1980	37

TABLES (Cont.)

Table No.		Page
2.13	Percentage Distribution of Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Females, Ages 16-64, by Labor Force Status and Poverty Status: 1980	38
2.14	Percentages of Limited English and English Proficient Adults Below 1.25 of Poverty by Household Type: 1980	39
2.15	Median Family Income and Earned Income for Limited English and English Proficient Adults in 1979	40
2.16	Median Hours Worked in 1979 for Limited English Proficient and English Proficient Adults by Sex	41
2.17	Median Hours Worked in 1979 for Limited English and English Proficient Males by Poverty Status	42
3.1	Limited English Proficient Population by Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Sex: 1980	50
3.2	Reported and Assumed Immigration of Limited English Proficient Persons by Racial/Ethnic Group: 1980-1985 and 1995-2000	54
3.3	Limited English Proficient Population, Ages 16-64, by Race/Ethnicity: 1980-2000	55
3.4	Estimated Percentage of Limited English Proficient Persons by Years Since Immigration, by Age in 1980 and Race/Ethnicity	57
3.5	Percentage of Limited English Proficient Persons by Age in 1980 and Race/Ethnicity for the Native Born Population	59
4.1	Number of Persons Below Poverty Level and Poverty Rate for the Total U.S. Population and for Persons of Spanish Origin: 1973-1987	64
4.2	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Adults by Poverty Status: 1990 and 2000	66
4.3	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Race/Ethnicity and Poverty Status: 1990 and 2000	67
4.4	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Geographic Region and Poverty Status: 1990 and 2000	68

TABLES (Cont.)

Table No.		Page
4.5	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Adults by Years of School Completed and Poverty Status: 1990 and 2000	69
4.6	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Adults Unemployed or Not in the Labor Force by Sex: 1990 and 200[illegible]	70
4.7	Projected Number of Limited English Proficient Female Headed Households, No Husband Present, by Poverty Status: 1990 and 2000	70

APPENDIX TABLES

Appendix A

A-1	English Proficiency by Sex and Poverty Status
A-2	English Proficiency by Age Groups and Poverty Status
A-3	English Proficiency by Race/Ethnicity and Poverty Status
A-4	English Proficiency by Spanish Origin and Poverty Status
A-5	English Proficiency by Geographical Region and Poverty Status
A-6	English Proficiency by Urban/Non-Urban Residency and Poverty Status
A-7	English Proficiency by Year of Immigration and Poverty Status
A-8	English Proficiency by Citizenship Status and Poverty Status
A-9	English Proficiency by Years of School Completed and Poverty Status
A-10	English Proficiency by School Enrollment and Poverty Status
A-11	English Proficiency by Labor Force Status and Poverty Status: Males
A-12	English Proficiency by Labor Force Status and Poverty Status: Females
A-13	English Proficiency by Household Type and Poverty Status
A-14	English Proficiency by Family Income
A-15	English Proficiency by Earned Income and Sex for Full Time Workers
A-16	English Proficiency for Persons Receiving Public Assistance Income in 1979 by Sex
A-17	Characteristics of Native-Born Limited English Proficient Adults

Appendix B

B-1	Projections of Total Limited English Proficient Persons, Ages 16-64, by Sex: 1980-2000
B-2	Projections of Hispanic Limited English Proficient Persons, Ages 16-64, by Sex: 1980-2000
B-3	Projections of Asian Limited English Proficient Persons, Ages 16-64, by Sex: 1980-2000
B-4	Projections of Black Limited English Proficient Persons, Ages 16-64, by Sex: 1980-2000
B-5	Projections of White Limited English Proficient Persons, Ages 16-64, by Sex: 1980-2000

Appendix C:

C-1 Estimated Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Sex and Poverty Status: 1980, 1990, and 2000 (ages 16-64)

C-2 Estimated Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Age Group and Poverty Status: 1980, 1990, and 2000 (ages 16-64)

C-3 Estimated Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Race/Ethnicity and Poverty Status: 1980, 1990, and 2000 (ages 16-64)

C-4 Estimated Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Geographic Region and Poverty Status: 1980, 1990, and 2000 (ages 16-64)

C-5 Estimated Number of Limited English Proficient Persons by Years of School Completed: 1980, 1990, and 2000 (ages 16-64)

c. **Age**

The largest number of poor limited English proficient persons is expected to be in the 16 to 35 year age range. Well over half of the limited English proficient adult population below 1.99 times the poverty level are expected to be in this age range. The concentration in the lower age ranges is partly due to the younger age structure of the population and partly the result of the relationship between age and income. Based on the research, however, large numbers of the limited English proficient population below 1.99 times the poverty level are not expected to have the upward occupational mobility associated with increased years in the U.S. that was demonstrated by earlier immigrants. The limited potential for upward mobility will be due, in part, to the relatively low median educational level of this population.

d. **Education**

In 1980, limited English proficient adults had a median educational level of 9.4 years, which is equivalent to completing the first year of high school. By comparison, English proficient adults had a median educational level of 12.1 years. Furthermore, educational level is associated with poverty. The number of limited English proficient adults who will not be high school graduates and will be living below 1.99 times the poverty level is projected to be 3,813,571 by 1990 and 5,716,476 by 2000.

A large number of the less educated will not only be English deficient but will also lack basic skills required to compete in the future job market. Based on current trends, many will be adults from developing countries or will be school drop-outs in this country, including large numbers of Mexican and Puerto Rican youth.

Better educated limited English proficient adults, who are literate in their own language, should assimilate more readily, depending on the extent to which they have relevant basic skills. They should be able to use written materials to learn a skill.

e. **Year of Immigration**

In 1980, about two-thirds of the limited English proficient adults were foreign born and less than half were citizens. Poverty appears to be associated with recency of immigration, with the more recent immigrants being the most likely to live in poverty.

f. **Geographic Distribution and Urbanicity**

Limited English proficient persons are highly concentrated in certain areas of the country, and this is expected to continue. Of the four Census regions of the United States, the West is expected to have 37 percent of the limited English proficient adult population under 1.99

5. Characteristics of Limited English Proficient Adults

Following is a summary of the characteristics of the limited English proficient adult population based on an analysis of the 1980 Census data, the literature review, and the projections.

a. English Proficiency

The native language or mother tongue of limited English proficient persons is, by definition, other than English. Over half (56 percent) of the limited English proficient adult population in the U.S. speak Spanish. The other limited English proficient adults speak a mix of Asian, European, and other languages.

The likelihood of becoming English proficient is greatest within ten years following immigration. Beyond this, the likelihood decreases. The Hispanic population, as a whole, both immigrants and native born, have higher rates of persons who are limited English proficient across all age groups compared to persons in other racial/ethnic categories.

Fluency in English is important for economic assimilation because it is the language of the U.S. labor force. English proficiency facilities integration into information networks, increases productivity, and increases the potential for geographic mobility. English fluency improves with the number of years of schooling in the United States. It continues to improve during the work years, but not as rapidly. Adults who receive all of their schooling prior to coming to this country are the least English proficient, but generally their English improves with time, if they are exposed to it enough and are not isolated in ethnic enclaves.

b. Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin

Over 70 percent of the limited English proficient adults living below 1.99 times the poverty level in the year 2000 will be Hispanics. Of these Hispanics, the largest number will be of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin. An additional 19 percent of the low income limited English proficient adult population will be from various Asian countries, and a large proportion of these will be from the developing countries of southeast Asia. There will also be small numbers of Black non-Hispanic, White non-Hispanic, and Native American (including American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts) low income limited English proficient adults.

There are significant differences in the percentage of limited English proficient adults below 1.25 times the poverty level within each racial/ethnic category. Ranging from high to low, the percentages are: Persons in the "Other non-Hispanic" category, comprised mostly of Native Americans (50 percent); Puerto Rican (46 percent); Mexican (35 percent); Black non-Hispanic (30 percent); other Hispanic, comprised mostly of persons from Central and South America (28 percent); Asian (21 percent); Cuban (16 percent); and White non-Hispanic (15 percent).

times the poverty level by the year 2000. Most will be persons of Mexican origin and Asian origin in California. Twenty-eight percent will be in the South. A majority of these will be persons of Mexican origin in Texas. Florida will also have large numbers of low income limited English proficient adults. An additional 26 percent will live in the Northeast region, mostly in the New York City metropolitan area. A large percentage of these will be Puerto Rican, but there will also be persons from the other racial/ethnic populations as well. The Midwest is projected to have 9 percent of the low income limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000. They will be concentrated mostly in the Chicago metropolitan area, and a large percentage will be Hispanic.

The newer immigrants tend to arrive in a number of "gateway" cities and settle there, accounting for the fact that over half of the more recent arrivals are in the four states of California, New York, Texas, and Florida. Immigrants often settle in ethnic enclaves, and the less educated, less skilled limited English proficient population tends to concentrate in these enclaves. Newer immigrants are less likely than other residents to disperse geographically to take advantage of better job opportunities and higher wages in other areas of the country. Their English deficiency and lack of knowledge concerning the U.S. labor market may hamper their geographic mobility and, thus, their economic assimilation.

The majority of limited English proficient adults are in urban areas and do best economically in these areas. Many of those in rural areas are at greater risk of poverty. Migrant farmworkers and their children are a special case in point. A large number of farmworkers are limited English proficient, speaking only Spanish. Their median educational level is 7.7 years of school, and their children have very high dropout rates. A large number leave farmwork after five to fifteen years because of the grueling labor.

g. Labor Force Status

Immigrants with U.S.-specific human capital, in terms of language, education and skills, assimilate into the U.S. economy more readily than those without these attributes. The vast majority of the newer immigrants are from non-English speaking, less developed countries of Southeast Asia and Latin America. They must not only learn the language, but must also adjust to a different economic structure. A smaller proportion of the immigrants are from emerging or industrialized countries of Asia and Europe with similar economic structures. Even though language may be a problem initially, immigrants from these countries seem to do better economically than those from less developed countries.

Overall, non-English speaking immigrants do less well economically than their native born counterparts. Immigrants tend to be concentrated in low wage, low skill jobs, experience downward occupational mobility, or can only find part-time employment. Some

withdraw from the labor force altogether. The economic cost of limited English proficiency is ethnically and occupationally specific. The negative effect of limited English proficiency is greatest in the skilled occupations, where wages are highest. In a study that compared foreign born and native born Asian and Hispanic men, foreign born Asians did better in all occupational categories than foreign born Hispanic men, possibly because the Asians find work in ethnic business enclaves where English is not as important. Except for the Cubans, Hispanics generally do not have access to ethnic business enclaves at the same rate.

h. **Income and Earnings**

Limited English proficient adults have lower incomes than English proficient adults, and females in both populations earn less than their male counterparts. Compared to English proficient males, limited English proficient males earn 33 percent less, English proficient females earn 45 percent less, and limited English proficient females earn 58 percent less. Recent research indicates that newer immigrants are less likely than earlier immigrants to reach earnings parity with the native born population in their lifetime, primarily due to lack of U.S. specific human capital.

Limited English proficient adults are more than twice as likely as English proficient adults to live below 1.25 times the poverty level. Furthermore, almost half of the limited English proficient adults are below 1.99 times the poverty level compared to about a quarter of the English proficient adults.

Part of the wage differential between limited English and English proficient adults is a function of differences in hours worked. English proficient adults worked somewhat more hours in 1979 than limited English proficient adults, and males in both populations worked more hours than females. Limited English proficient adults living in poverty tend to work less than full-time.

Many immigrant families rely on multiple wage earners to improve family income and to reach self-sufficiency, and immigrant groups with two wage earners tend to have higher incomes. The low mean family income of Mexicans is partially due to the low labor force participation rate of Mexican females. This low rate may be associated with the high fertility rate for Mexican females, indicating possible family responsibilities that preclude employment.

The sources and amounts of family income vary among Hispanic ethnic groups. Puerto Ricans have the lowest family incomes, and Mexicans have the next lowest family incomes. Cubans and Central and South Americans have much higher family incomes than the Puerto Ricans or Mexicans, but not quite as high as White non-Hispanics.

Puerto Ricans also had the lowest earned income and the highest non-labor incomes (including transfer income) compared to the other Hispanics. This disparity between Puerto Ricans and other Hispanics is possibly due to Puerto Ricans, on average, having low skills and being concentrated in a high skill labor market where transfer income is generous. A high percentage of Mexicans have low skills, but they tend to be concentrated in low wage areas, which may make it easier to obtain employment. Cubans and South and Central Americans are more likely to have earnings from wives and female family heads than the other Hispanics. Their mean family incomes are somewhat less than those of White non-Hispanics primarily due to the lower earnings of male family heads.

The vast majority (over 90 percent) of both the limited English and the English proficient adult populations did not receive public assistance in 1979. However, limited English proficient adults were 1.75 times more likely to receive public assistance than English proficient adults; but there were eleven times as many English proficient as limited English proficient adults receiving public assistance. Females in both populations were more likely to receive public assistance than males.

i. Household Type

There is little difference in household types between limited English proficient and English proficient adults. Three-quarters of both populations live in married couple households; and this household type has the lowest percentage of persons living in poverty of any household type. Female headed households with no husband present have the highest percentage of families living in poverty in both the limited English and the English proficient populations.

j. Native Born

Over one-third, or 2.3 million, of the limited English proficient adult population is native born, with a median age of 39.0 years. The largest percentage are Hispanic, most of whom are of Mexican and Puerto Rican origin. Another third are White non-Hispanic. Thirty-three percent live the South, largely in Florida and Texas. Another 25 percent reside in the West, primarily in California, and 29 percent live in the Northeast, especially New York, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. An additional 13 percent live in the Midwest.

The native born limited English proficient adult population is somewhat more female than male, has somewhat higher percentages of female headed households than the limited English proficient adult population in general, has a relatively low level of education, and a comparatively high percentage of persons receiving public assistance. Almost one-third live in poverty, and close to forty percent are not in the labor force.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Purpose

The purpose of the study described in this report is to estimate the size of the limited English proficient adult and out-of-school youth population in need of vocational education and related employment services, and to project the size of this population from the present to the year 2000.

B. Procedures

The procedures included a literature review, an analysis of 1980 Census data, and projections of the limited English proficient adult population and the population in need of employment training to the year 2000.

The 1980 Census PUMS C file, which is a one percent sample of the population, was chosen as the most appropriate database for the study. The population used in the analysis consisted of adults and out-of-school youth ages 16-64. Five major racial/ethnic categories were used to describe the population: White non-Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Asian, Hispanic, and other non-Hispanic. The Hispanic population was further categorized into Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Hispanic. The Asian category included Pacific Islanders.

Two measures were constructed from census data to assist in the analysis. The first was a measure of language proficiency. This measure was used to categorize persons either as limited English proficient or as English proficient based on responses to a language usage question in the 1980 Census. The other measure categorized individuals by poverty status as follows:

- Below 1.25 times the poverty level;
- 1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level; and
- 2.00 or more times the poverty level.

With the poverty level set at 1.00, 1.25 is 125 percent of the poverty level and 1.99 is 199 percent of the poverty level, etc. The family income for persons at 1.24 times the poverty level was less than half the median family income for the total U.S. population in 1979. Those at and below this level exist in poor economic conditions. Those at 1.99 times the poverty level had a family income of less than three-quarters of the national median family income in 1979 and may be thought of as living at the lower end of the middle class. Consequently, the majority of persons living between 1.25 and 1.99 would be fairly poor and any downturn in the economy or personal circumstances could jeopardize their minimal economic well-being.

C. Study Findings

Study findings, including the literature review, the analysis of the 1980 Census data, and projections to the year 2000, are summarized below.

1. **Trends in Immigration**

The size of the immigrant flow has grown steadily since 1965 until it is almost as high as it was in the 1900s. Many of the most recent immigrants are less educated and less skilled than those who entered the country 15 to 20 years ago.

2. **Estimates of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population from the 1980 Census**

Using a measure of English proficiency derived from the census, the number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, was estimated to be 6.8 million in 1980. Of these, 56 percent were Hispanic, 27 percent were White non-Hispanic, 13 percent were Asian, 2 percent were Black non-Hispanic, and 2 percent were Other non-Hispanic. The limited English proficient adult population was about 4 percent of the total U.S. population, ages 16-64, in 1980.

3. **Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population to the Year 2000**

The number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, is projected to be about 11.6 million by 1990 and about 17.4 million by 2000. This is a 156 percent increase in the limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000. The increase takes into account the cumulative effect of annual net migration from 1980 to 2000,. It does not, however, account for those who become English proficient during this period.

The limited English proficient adult population will become increasingly Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander and less White European. The population will also be increasingly from developing countries. Currently, the highest proportion of limited English proficient adults are Hispanics, and this proportion will increase by the year 2000. There will continue to be a small but significant number of limited English proficient adults who are native born.

4. **Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training to the Year 2000**

The number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, who could require employment training and related services is projected to be about 5.5 million in 1990 and about 8.0 million in 2000. Persons in need of services are defined by their poverty status: (1) those below 1.25 times the poverty level who are considered "most at risk," and (2) those between 1.25 and 1.99 times the poverty level who are considered "potentially at risk." The "most at risk" limited English proficient adult population is projected to be about 3.3 million by 1990 and about 4.7 million by 2000. The "potentially at risk" population is expected to reach about 2.2 million by 1990 and about 3.3 million by 2000. These numbers do not take into account language assimilation or upward mobility.

I. INTRODUCTION

The economic assimilation of persons with limited English proficiency is a policy issue of growing importance due, in part, to increased immigration over the past few decades, and its perceived effects on the U.S. labor force. The purpose of the research described in this report is to estimate and project the size of the limited English proficient adult and out-of-school youth population from the present to the year 2000 and to describe their characteristics. The portion of that population in need of employment related training and services is also estimated.

Chapter I reviews the literature related to immigration and the economic assimilation of immigrants and language minorities. Chapter II describes the current limited English proficient adult population and its needs for employment training. Projections of the limited English proficient adult population are given in Chapter III. Finally, estimates and projections of the limited English proficient adult population in need of employment training to the year 2000 are presented in Chapter IV.

A. Background

Net migration from other countries is the single most important factor in estimating the number of limited English proficient adults. This includes legal and illegal net migration, as well as unrestricted migration to and from Puerto Rico. Characteristics of the immigrant population and its need for employment training are related to five factors: 1) motives for persons to emigrate, 2) educational and economic opportunities in the immigrants' countries of origin, 3) the immigrants' socioeconomic status in their countries of origin, 4) trends in U.S. immigration and refugee policies, and 5) opportunities for legal or illegal immigration. The influence of these and other factors on the economic assimilation of limited English proficient adults are summarized in the review of the literature presented in this chapter.

1. Trends in U.S. Immigration Since 1965

Immigration has become one of the most important determinants in U.S. population growth in the last two decades. The number of immigrants entering the country since 1965 are almost as high as that recorded in the early 1900s. Included in this influx are legal immigrants, refugees, asylees, and illegal immigrants. Borjas (1988:1) reports that the legal flow of immigrants averaged 252,000 per year in the 1950s. The average annual flow increased to 449,000 by the 1970s and to 570,000 by the early 1980s.

This section provides an overview of trends in U.S. immigration since 1965 as reported in Bouvier and Gardner, "Immigration to the U.S.: The Unfinished Story", supplemented with other literature on the subject.

a. Legal Immigration

Over the years, immigration legislation has resulted in a shift in the size and composition of the immigration population. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 continued the long time practice of using national origin to assign quotas. The annual quota for the Eastern Hemisphere was set at 158,561. Eighty-five percent of this number went to countries of northeastern Europe. The quotas for some Asian and other countries were limited to 100 each. No ceiling was set for the Western Hemisphere.

The 1952 Act also established a preference system. Under this system, first preference for immigration was for highly skilled persons whose services were needed in the United States, as well as their spouses and children. Up to 50 percent of each country's visas were reserved for this preference category. Other preferences were for close relatives of U.S. citizens or permanent resident aliens. Congress later amended the legislation so that spouses and children of U.S. citizens could immigrate beyond the established quotas (Bouvier & Gardner, 1983:12-13).

The Immigration Act of 1965 began a new era in U.S. immigration policy. The Act abolished the national origin system, especially discrimination against Asians that was contained in earlier legislation. The annual immigration quota was

raised to 170,000 for the Eastern Hemisphere, with a limit of 20,000 from a single country, and to 120,000 for Western Hemisphere. In 1978, the quotas were revised again to a worldwide ceiling of 290,000, with a limit of 20,000 from a single country. The ceiling was reduced to 280,000 and then 270,000 by the 1980 Refugee Act. Overall, the legislation has opened immigration to Asians and continued the relatively open policy toward Latin America (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:13-14).

The 1965 Act shifted the preference system to family reunification. As a result, 90 percent of legal immigration is based on family reunification with only 10 percent geared to labor market demand (Committee on the Judiciary, 1988:4). This policy has resulted in a major shift in source countries for U.S. immigration from Europe and Canada prior to 1960 to Asia and Latin America from the 1960s on, as shown in Table 1.1. Many of the newer immigrants were from developing countries. Furthermore, the number of legal immigrants who actually entered the country far exceeded numerical limitations in the legislation since there are no restrictions on parents, spouses, and minor children.

TABLE 1.1

PERCENTAGE OF LEGAL IMMIGRANTS BY REGION OF LAST RESIDENCE: 1921-1985

	Percent 1921-60	Percent 1961-70	Percent 1971-80	Percent 1981-85
North and West Europe	38	18	7	5
South and East Europe	20	15	11	6
North America	19	12	4	2
Latin America	18	39	40	35
Asia	4	13	35	48
Other	1	3	3	4

Source: Excerpted from Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:17.

b. Refugees and Asyless

A substantial number of persons enter the country each year as refugees. The 1980 Refugee Act was an attempt to establish a universal selection process for refugees. Refugee quotas under the Act are determined annually by the President in consultation with the Congress and are not included in the overall immigration quotas. Increasing numbers of refugees entered the country on an ad hoc basis during the 1960s and 1970s, and on a flexible system after the 1980 legislation was passed. There are also provisions for asylees. These are persons who left their homelands for fear of persecution, but, unlike refugees, are already in the United States. Asylees can change to permanent status one year after their asylee status is approved (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:42).

The Mariel boatlift Cubans and the Haitians were categorized as "entrants" (status pending) upon their arrival in this country, because they were not officially refugees. The Mariel boatlift Cubans were eligible for permanent residence status in 1985, except for about 2,500, who remained in detention because of their questionable backgrounds. The Haitians were considered economic rather than political refugees. They were therefore categorized as "entrants" since the U.S. did not have provisions for economic refugees (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:41).

The peak year for legal immigration in recent years was 1980 with almost 800,000 admissions; 341,552 of these were refugees, asylees, and entrants (see Table 1.2). Refugees and asylees have declined in recent years, but there is no way to predict when and where the next large influx will originate.

Often refugees arrive in the United States in waves, with refugees in the various waves having differing characteristics. This was true of the Cuban and Southeast Asian refugees. The first waves of these refugees were comprised of persons from the upper middle classes in the source country. They had more human capital resources in terms of education, transferable skills, and familiarity with the language and culture of the United States than the later waves (Willette, et al., 1985).

TABLE 1.2
LEGAL IMMIGRATION FROM 1976 TO 1985

Year	Total	Immigrants subject to limitations	Immediate relatives and others exempt from limitations	Refugees paroled	Refugees arrived under 1980 Refugee Act	Asylees approved	Cuban-Haitian entrants
1976	462,221	257,425	113,083	91,713			
1977	398,089	275,531	117,857	4,701			
1978	502,959	341,104	137,866	23,989			
1979	526,066	279,478	148,821	97,767			
1980	796,356	289,479	165,325	110,868	89,580	1,104	140,000
1981	647,320	330,409	160,445	155,291	1,175		
1982	535,513	259,749	177,781	93,252	4,731		
1983	522,475	269,213	187,865	57,064	8,333		
1984	531,153	262,016	189,760	67,750	11,627		
1985	543,960	264,208	210,761	62,477	6,514		

Source: Derived from Bouvier and Gardner, 1986:44.

Among Cuban refugees, successive waves brought differing skills. The wealthier class left Cuba when Fidel Castro assumed power in 1959. From 1959 to 1962, 215,000 Cubans migrated to the United States. The second wave was from 1965 to 1973, during which time more than 340,000 Cubans emigrated to the United States. Even though the average educational and occupational achievements of these newer immigrants were greater than residents of Cuba as a whole, they represented increasing proportions of the lower middle and urban working classes (Portes and Bach, 1985). From May to September, 1980, approximately 124,800 Mariel boatlift Cubans entered the country. Most had jobs in urban manufacturing, construction, and the service sectors in Cuba (Portes & Bach, 1985:87).

A similar phenomenon happened with the Vietnamese. Large waves of Vietnamese immigrants resettled in the United States following the pull-out of American troops in April 1975. During April and May, 1975, alone, an estimated 130,000 South Vietnamese refugees resettled in the United States under provisions of the 1975 Indochina Migration Act. The majority of the first wave were from South Vietnam's upper and upper middle classes. Most were well educated and had the resources necessary to evacuate as soon as American involvement ended. The second wave became known as the "boat people." These refugees were relatively less educated compared to the earlier wave (Nguyen and Henkin, 1982). Between 1975 and September 30, 1986, 806,245 Southeast Asian refugees arrived in the United States. Most, but not all, were from Vietnam (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1987).

Since 1960, refugees have been considered the responsibility of the Federal government for the first 31 months, or until they are self-sufficient. Assistance is provided in the form of income, education, medical care, English language training, and employment. Some refugees have continued their dependency on public assistance beyond the 31 months. A 1986 Office of Refugee Resettlement survey indicated that refugees increasingly move toward economic self-sufficiency. However, about 20 percent receive a combination of earned and assistance income and some have withdrawn from the labor force (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1987:117).

c. Illegal Immigration

Estimating the number of illegal immigrants is difficult, since, by definition, they are undocumented and many of the same people move back and forth across the Mexican border. Census Bureau researchers make distinctions between three types of illegal immigrants: "settlers," "sojourners," and "commuters." Settlers come to the United States primarily on a permanent basis, whereas sojourners stay temporarily and include such groups as seasonal farmworkers. Commuters cross the border daily. The Border Patrol reported a considerable increase in the apprehension of families in 1986, perhaps, indicating that more illegal immigrants than in previous years are planning to stay in the United States permanently (Bouvier and Gardner, 1986:36-37).

Estimates of the number of illegal immigrants entering the country vary. Passel (1986) estimated the net increase in "settled" illegal immigrants as 100,000 to 300,000 between 1980 and 1983. The INS, on the other hand, estimated in 1986 that the net annual increase is closer to 500,000. In any event, most sources indicate that there are large numbers of illegal immigrants in the country and the numbers are growing (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:38). But Borjas (1988:1) states that the number of illegals is relatively small compared to the 5 million legal immigrants who enter the country per decade.

It is estimated that over three-quarters of illegal immigrants are from Latin America, mostly from Mexico. They tend to live in metropolitan areas with high concentrations of Hispanics such as Los Angeles, New York, and Chicago. There are also high concentrations of illegal immigrants in Texas, but it is more difficult to estimate the number because of the high rate of migration to and from Mexico in that area (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:38).

Borjas' indicates that the illegal Mexican population enumerated in the 1980 Census has characteristics that suggest a degree of permanency. He notes that a large number of non-citizen Mexican born aliens are working in occupations other than agriculture and are living with close relatives, such as a spouse, child, or parent. Most appear to be settled in established households (Borjas, 1988:6).

d. Recent and Proposed Immigration Legislation

The Immigration Reform and Control Act was passed in 1986 in an effort to curtail the flow of illegal immigration and still meet the labor demands of U.S. agriculture. The Act has three main parts:

1. The law makes it illegal to knowingly hire an alien who is not authorized to work in the United States.
2. A one-time amnesty was granted to aliens who entered the country illegally before January 1, 1982.
3. Residency was offered to aliens who worked in U.S. agriculture for at least 90 days between May 1985 and May 1986.

When the amnesty began, the number of aliens caught by the U.S. Border Patrol dropped significantly. But as the period for amnesty came to a close, the number of apprehensions began to increase again, reaching numbers closer to the normal arrest rates before the legislation was passed. Additionally, the number of aliens other than Mexicans arrested crossing the border has doubled in some areas. Many of these persons are from El Salvador and Guatemala (Maraniss, 1988:A4). It remains to be seen whether employer sanctions will stem the flow of illegal immigration into the country.

Congress is considering changes in the 1965 legislation that are expected to reduce the large numbers of legal immigrants that are currently entering the country under family reunification. The number of legal immigrants and refugees who have entered the country is more than twice the annual ceiling of 270,000 provided for in the current legislation. This is because spouses, children, and parents of U.S. citizens, refugees, and approved asylees adjusting to resident status fall outside of the numerical limits for legal immigrants and refugees. The greatest annual increase was between 1984 and 1985 when a large number of permanent resident aliens became naturalized citizens and, thus, eligible to bring in close relatives without restrictions (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:40).

Eliminating the preference for siblings is also proposed for the new legislation. The current law permits up to 24 percent of the legal immigrants to be brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens over age 21. Elimination of this preference is expected to curtail the chain migration of extended families that is now taking place (Bouvier & Gardner, 1986:40).

On March 15, 1988, the U.S. Senate unanimously passed the Immigration Act of 1988. The bill was being reviewed in the House during the summer of 1988, and its future is uncertain at this writing. The Act is part of a major revision of the immigration laws that began with the 1986 legislation. Under this new bill, family reunification would still be a high priority, but there would be a ceiling on the numbers who could immigrate.

Additionally, a new category of "independent immigrants" based on a point system would be created, similar to the systems now being used in Canada and Australia. Visas in this category would be reserved for persons with skills that are in short supply in the United States, and for persons who have not been able to immigrate because they have no family connections in this country (Committee on the Judiciary, 1988:2-3).

The new legislation would increase the ceiling for legal immigration to 590,000 per year. During the first three years after enactment, 470,000 visas would be for family members and 120,000 would be for non-family, or independent immigrants. This would change after three years with 440,000 visas reserved for family immigration and 150,000 for independent immigration.

Higher priority would be given to the closest family members in a revised preference system. A new point system based on education, work experience, occupational demand, age and English language skills would be used for a pool of 55,000 visas (Committee on the Judiciary, 1988). The bill is designed to increase the flow of skilled workers and the number of Western Europeans to the United States.

2. Economic Assimilation

The extent to which immigrants possess "U.S.-specific human capital" facilitates their assimilation into the U.S. economy (Borjas, 1985:464). Among these human capital attributes is English language proficiency, since English is the predominant language in the U.S. labor market. Another is the possession of marketable skills, that is, skills that are in demand. Differences in these attributes among immigrant populations are associated with differential access to

the U.S. labor market and differential earnings and income. Conversely, the impact that immigrants have on the labor market is mostly a result of their concentration in a few areas of the country, economic conditions in those areas, and the human capital attributes of the immigrants who settle in those areas.

a. Access to the U.S. Labor Market

A common theme in the literature on the relationship between English proficiency and employment is that limited English proficiency has a negative influence on access to the U.S. labor market and on occupational choice. On average, immigrants who are in the labor market are concentrated in low wage jobs (Kossoudji, 1988:206-207; Light, 1984:198; and Wilson & Martin, 1982;136). Many immigrants are "pushed down," according to Kossoudji (1988:218), or experience downward occupational mobility due to deficiency in the English language. There is clear evidence that English language deficiency has a greater negative effect in the skilled occupations where wages are highest (McManus, et al., 1983:122). Immigrants with little or no English and few transferable skills are often relegated to entry-level low paying occupations where knowing English is not a necessity.

Kossoudji's research indicates that the economic cost of English language deficiency is ethnically and occupationally specific. The cost is higher for foreign born Hispanic men than for foreign born Asian men at all skill levels. The most consistent finding is that English deficiency pushes Hispanic men away from professional and managerial positions (Kossoudji, 1988:218). The author suggests that Asians who do not speak English may be working in ethnic enclaves where their native language is more of an asset than a liability. Except for Cubans, Hispanics generally do not have such an economic support system that provides alternative opportunities (Kossoudji, 1988:219-220).

Ethnic enclaves have provided support for immigrants throughout the history of the country, with varying degrees of success. Recent studies have examined enclaves of Cubans in Miami (Wilson & Martin, 1982) and Asians in various parts of the country (Bonacich, et al., 1980; Chung, 1979; Light, 1979; and Min, 1984). These groups have established successful business communities in some

cities. According to these studies, many limited English proficient immigrants start small businesses because they view business ownership as an opportunity for upward mobility that is not available to them in the U.S. labor market. These businesses also provide employment for newcomers from the same ethnic background. However, going into business, becoming self-employed, or being employed in an ethnic enclave are often viewed as socieconomic adaptations to blocked opportunities in the U.S. labor market for some groups.

Another kind of adaptation is withdrawal from the labor force. There is some evidence that limited access to, or total withdrawal from, the labor market is associated with limited English proficiency. As an example, Veltman (1988) found that Hispanic men who did not speak English were more heavily concentrated in part-time employment than other men, and limited English proficient women were underrepresented in both part-time and full-time employment. This finding is supported by Cooney and Ortiz (1983) who show that native born Puerto Rican and Mexican females have higher labor force participation rates than their foreign born counterparts. Additionally, they found that Hispanic women in high skill occupations are better educated and more English proficient than those in low skill occupations.

Cooney and Ortiz (1983:516) also found that in addition to English proficiency and education, characteristics of the local labor market and alternative sources of income, such as welfare, make a difference in labor force participation. The authors show that foreign born Puerto Rican females had a much lower labor force participation rate (32.5 percent) than foreign born Mexican females (46.2 percent), even though the Puerto Rican females were better educated and had greater English proficiency than the Mexican females. They suggest that this apparent anomaly may occur because Puerto Ricans reside in areas where there are few low skill jobs, whereas Mexicans reside in areas where low skill jobs are plentiful. With low skill jobs unavailable, Puerto Rican women often must rely on welfare.

Migrant farmworkers and their children have unique concerns. Large numbers of these farmworkers are Spanish speaking and know little or no English. A 1983 survey showed that their median educational level was 7.7 years of school. About 15 percent were functionally illiterate and 70 percent had not completed high

school. The rate of school enrollment for the children of migrant farmworkers is lower than that of any other group in the country, and they have the highest drop-out rate (Interstate Migrant Education Council, 1987:8).

Most migrant farmworkers earn good wages while they are young, but their earnings drop off in later years. They usually cannot withstand the grueling labor after about five to fifteen years. Many, therefore, have to make a mid-life career change often resulting in a severe reduction in wages. According to the Interstate Migrant Education Council, English language instruction and job retraining are not keeping pace with the need among the settled-out migrant farmworkers (1987:6).

b. Earnings and Income

In his research on the relationship between English proficiency and wages, Grenier (1984:50) wrote:

> With regard to the nature of the mechanism by which language affects wages, the data appear to indicate that the language effect operates both through a better integration into information networks and through increased productivity.

As might be expected, English proficiency increases as time in the United States increases and schooling increases (both in the home country and the U.S.). A study of Hispanic men's earnings and the role of English proficiency conducted by McManus, et al., (1983:121) found that, among immigrants, those who arrived as preschoolers are the most English proficient. Proficiency improved as the number of years of schooling in the United States increased and continued to improve during the work years, but at a slower rate. The next most English proficient are immigrants who arrive in this country after having some schooling abroad and complete their schooling here. Adults who arrive after their schooling is completed are the least English proficient. Older adults who arrive in this country tend to be less English proficient, but proficiency improves with length of time in the country. For persons of equivalent educational attainment, the authors found no significant difference in earnings between native born persons and immigrants who received all of their schooling in the United States (McManus, et al., 1983:111).

There is agreement in the literature that, overall, native born persons earn more than persons who are foreign born (Grenier, 1984; McManus, et al., 1983; Kossoudji, 1984; and Tienda, 1983). Reimers (1984:898) emphasizes the importance of adjusting for demographic characteristics when making comparisons of earnings and income. Besides amount of schooling and length of time in the United States, some variables that need to be considered are labor force participation rates, hours worked, wage rate differences due to differences in the age structure of a group, educational levels, presence and age of children, and geographic location. Income tends to rise with age and education. Groups with a large proportion of women in their childbearing years will probably have lower female labor market participation rates. A group that is concentrated in low wage areas of the country, as the Mexicans are, will tend to have lower wages.

There is some question as to the length of time it takes immigrants to reach earnings parity with their native born counterparts. Most research on this issue relies on cross-section analysis with the results showing that immigrants reach parity in about 10-15 years. Borjas (1985:485) maintains that these cross-section studies yield misleading results regarding the process of immigrant assimilation. He found that the apparent rapid growth is offset, in part, by the decline in the "quality" of immigrants since 1950. The cross-section approach reflects the higher educational attainment and job skills of earlier immigrants as well as acquisition of other U.S. specific human capital attributes. Using cohort analysis with the 1970 and 1980 Census data, Borjas' results show that more recent immigrants reach parity much later, if at all (Borjas, 1985:465).

Borjas questions the traditional assumption that immigrants do well in the U.S. labor market. He maintains that success has not been the experience of a majority of the most recent immigrants, whose earnings capacities are far below those of earlier immigrants. He found that the earnings gap between immigrants and natives disappeared for earlier immigrants after 10-15 years, but the earnings gap between the 1975 to 1979 immigrants and natives will remain throughout the working life of the first generation (Borjas, 1988:8).

Borjas (1988:10) also notes that the newer immigrants are not likely to disperse geographically to take advantage of regional wage differentials. They

tend to arrive in a number of "gateway" cities and settle there. As a result, over half of the immigrants are in the four states of California, New York, Texas, and Florida.

Some determinants of immigrant success, according to Borjas (1987:544-549), are political and economic conditions in the source country and the characteristics of the immigrant population. Due to their self-selection, immigrants may be more highly motivated than native born persons. Those who migrate from English speaking countries earn over a quarter more upon entry than persons from non-English speaking countries. Borjas' research suggests that immigrants from countries with an economic structure similar to the United States and those who have greater skills do well. He also suggests that immigrants from politically unstable countries have a greater incentive to assimilate into the U.S. labor market.

An analysis of earnings for immigrants from 41 countries concludes that the propensity to do well is country and region specific. Immigrants from Western Europe do well, generally increasing their earnings. Immigrants from less developed countries do not do as well in the U.S. labor market and, on average, experience a decrease in earnings relative to skills (Borjas, 1987:550-551). Borjas speculates that changes in immigration policy may be the reason the United States no longer attracts immigrants who do well in the U.S. labor market (Borjas, 1988:17).

Borjas' findings are reinforced by other research. Chiswick (1986:189) reports that immigrants from the United Kingdom and Canada have the highest earnings of all immigrants. The next highest earnings are by immigrants from Europe, the Middle East, and South Asia. Immigrants from parts of Asia (including China, the Philippines, and Vietnam), Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa have the lowest earnings.

The more recent immigrants come from countries whose migrants tend to earn lower wages in the United States. As a result of the occupational preference in 1965 immigration legislation, the number of well-educated Asians entering the country increased sharply at first, but the level of education of later Asian

immigrants diminished over time. Mexican immigrants average about 7 years of education compared to about 11-12 years from other countries. Illegal immigration is a contributing factor to the increase in less educated Mexicans in this country (Chiswick, 1986:189).

Many immigrant families, especially those from developing countries, rely on multiple wage earners. Economic self-sufficiency often depends on the number of employable adults in the household. Caplan (1985) found that the presence of multiple wage earners was a significant factor in the achievement of economic independence for Southeast Asians. McManus, et al., (1983:107) attribute the lower mean 1975 income of Hispanics families, in comparison to Black families, to the lower labor force participation rates of Hispanic women. The difference is most notable for Mexicans who comprise the largest percentages of Hispanics in this country. The differential labor force participation rates among Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban women may be the consequence of family responsibilities, accordingto Bean (1982). In addition to language proficiency, educational level, and husband's income, the research indicated that high fertility depresses female participation rates.

Reimers (1984:891) found that the sources and amounts of family income varied among Hispanic groups. She used White non-Hispanic mean family income as a reference point in a study of Hispanic and Black family income in 1975. Puerto Rican income was the lowest at 58 percent of White non-Hispanic family income. Next lowest was Mexican family income, which was 65 percent of White non-Hispanic family income, and about the same rate as Blacks. Cubans and Central and South Americans averaged over 80 percent of White non-Hispanic family income.

Reimers (1984:892) also found that Puerto Ricans had the lowest earned individual income of any group. Male family heads and other family members earned only about half as much as White non-Hispanics, and female family heads and wives earned about 60 percent as much as White non-Hispanics. However, Puerto Rican family property and transfer income were about 79 percent of that for White non-Hispanics. Thus, other family members' income pulls the family income down, but the nonlabor income pulls it up somewhat.

Sources of Mexican family income were proportionally about the same as those for White non-Hispanics, but were overall much lower. By contrast, Cuban and Central and South American families obtain greater earnings from wives and female family heads than White non-Hispanic families. Family income still falls below the total family income of White non-Hispanics, however, due to lower earnings of male family heads and much lower nonlabor income.

Tienda (1983:69) cautions that increasing the English language skills of Hispanic workers is necessary for improving their chances in the labor market, but it is not sufficient for gaining earnings parity with majority Whites. An equally important issue is the relevancy of the workers' skills to the labor market.

c. Impact of Immigrants on the U.S. Labor Market

The labor market effects of immigrants are very localized, since they tend to concentrate in limited areas of the country (Greenwood & McDowell, 1986; Topel, 1988). Table 1.3 shows the six states with the highest concentrations of foreign born based on the 1980 Census.

TABLE 1.3

STATES WITH THE HIGHEST NUMBER OF FOREIGN BORN: 1980 CENSUS

State	Number of Foreign Born (in thousands)	Percent Population Foreign born
California	3,580	15.1
New York	2,389	13.6
Florida	1,059	10.9
Texas	856	6.0
Illinois	824	7.2
New Jersey	758	10.3

Refugees comprise different proportions of the foreign born population in these states. The Cubans and Haitians settled mostly in Florida with the largest number in the Miami area. The States of California, Texas, Washington, and New York had the largest number of Southeast Asian refugees at the close of 1986. California had, by far, the largest number - 316,200 - which is 39.2 percent of the total Southeast Asian refugee population (Office of Refugee Resettlement, 1987:96).

Immigration has, of course, continued since the 1980 Census was taken so the numbers are somewhat dated, but most new immigrants have settled in areas where previous immigrants reside. This trend has the effect of increasing the number of foreign born in the same geographic areas and promoting the establishment and perpetuation of ethnic enclaves. In 1980, forty percent of recent immigrants were located in six metropolitan areas as follows: New York City (13.8 percent), Los Angeles (11.8 percent), Chicago (5.3 percent), Miami (4.1 percent), San Francisco (3.6 percent), and Houston (1.6 percent). Immigrants accounted for two-thirds of the labor force growth in Los Angeles in 1970-1980 (Topel, 1988:3). Other researchers think that illegal immigrants may be even more concentrated due to their source and entry points (Greenwood & Mc Dowell, 1986:1756).

There is some question as to the impact of so many foreign born and limited English proficient persons on the local labor market. Bernard considers it a fallacy that immigrants take jobs away from native born Americans. He argues that the job market is not fixed. When the population grows, the number of jobs also grow (Bernard, 1953:57). Some research shows that high concentrations of immigrants in certain regions and industries may limit the job opportunities of less skilled native born workers, but the impact is not great (Greenwood & McDowell, 1986:1756-1757).

Results of Topel's research indicate that new immigrants tend to replace older immigrants in entry level jobs rather than compete with the native born population. Immigrants are concentrated in just a few industries such as restaurants and bars, apparel, manufacturing, private household services, hotels and motels, agriculture, textile mills, and transportation services. When there is a large influx of immigrants into an area, wages in the industries where most immigrants are concentrated tend to decrease slightly, thus, affecting other immigrants more than the native born population (Topel, 1988:3-4).

B. Summary

The purpose of the study described in this report is to estimate and project the limited English proficient adult and out-of-school youth population in need of vocational education and related employment services from the present to the year 2000. The report begins with a review of the literature on immigration and the economic assimilation of language minorities.

The research literature indicates that there has been a large influx of immigrants and a policy change which resulted in a shift toward attracting less skilled immigrants since the early 1970s compared with the 1960s. The specific changes include : 1) a large number of refugees entering the country, primarily from Southeast Asia; 2) a change in the U.S. immigration laws in the mid 1960s that favored family reunification rather than occupational skills in demand; and 3) a continual flow of unskilled, less educated illegal immigrants.

Immigrants with U.S.-specific human capital, in terms of language and skills assimilate into the U.S. economy more readily than those without these attributes. The vast majority of the newer entrants are from non-English speaking, less developed countries of Southeast Asia and Latin America. They must not only learn the language, but must also adjust to different types of opportunities. A smaller proportion of the immigrants are from emerging or industrialized countries of Asia and Europe with an occupational structure similar to the U.S. Even though language may be a problem initially, immigrants from these countries seem to do better economically than those from less developed countries.

Overall, recent non-English speaking immigrants do less well economically than their native born counterparts. Immigrants tend to be concentrated in low wage, low skill jobs, and experience downward occupational mobility. They are more likely to be employed part-time. Some withdraw from the labor force altogether. Detailed research shows that the economic cost of limited English proficiency is ethnically and occupationally specific. A study that compared foreign born and native born Asian and Hispanic men indicates that foreign born Asians do better in all skill categories than foreign born Hispanic men, possibly because the Asians find work in ethnic business enclaves where English is not as important. Except for the Cubans, Hispanics generally do not have such economic support systems.

Fluency in English is important for economic assimilation because it is the language of the U.S. labor market. Fluency improves with the number of years of schooling in the United States. It continues to improve during the work years but not as rapidly. Adults who receive all of their schooling prior to coming to this country are the least English proficient, but their English improves with time.

Cross-section research indicates that immigrants reach earnings parity with their native born counterparts in 10-15 years. Using a cohort analysis, however, Borjas found that parity is reached much later, if at all.

Many immigrant families rely on multiple wage earners to improve family income and to reach self-sufficiency. The low mean family income of Mexicans is partially due to the low labor force participation rate of Mexican females. The sources and amounts of family income vary among Hispanic ethnic groups. Puerto Ricans make the least, and Mexicans make the next lowest. Cubans and Central and South Americans have much higher family incomes than the Puerto Ricans or Mexicans, but not quite as high as White non-Hispanics.

The labor market effects of immigrants and limited English proficient persons are localized due to their concentration in certain metropolitan areas and states. The states with the highest number of foreign born in 1980 were California, New York, Florida, Texas, Illinois, and New Jersey. Immigrants also tend to be concentrated in certain industries.

Research indicates that large numbers of immigrants in these areas may negatively affect the less skilled native born workers rather than the skilled workers. Any negative effect, however, is not significant. There is evidence that newer entrants tend to compete with older immigrants rather than native born workers. When there is a large influx of immigrants into an area, wages in the industries where they are concentrated decrease somewhat.

0423y/10.88

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION IN NEED OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING

As previously stated, the goal of the research described in this report was to estimate and project the limited English proficient adult population in need of employment training and related services. This chapter discusses the methodology used for the estimates and describes some of the characteristics of the population.

A. Procedures

In selecting the appropriate database, several major characteristics were identified as critical. The database had to be large enough to examine racial/ethnic groups by sex and age, and it had to have a fertility variable in order to make projections to the future. Equally important was that the database have a language variable, and that it contain sufficient socioeconomic data to assess training and other service needs. Additionally, we wanted to use existing measures to the extent possible. The 1980 Census PUMS C file, which is a one percent sample of the population, was finally selected as the most comprehensive database for the study.

The population under examination was defined as adults and out-of-school youth, ages 16-64. The selection of this age range reflects eligibility criteria in the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984. The Act provides vocational training of limited English proficient adults through several setasides, as well as through the Bilingual Vocational Training (BVT) program. In the latter program, adults and out-of-school youth are the target of a direct federal grant program.

Five major racial/ethnic categories were used in the analysis: White, Black, Asians, Hispanics, and other Non-Hispanics. The Hispanic population was further categorized as Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and Other Hispanics for some of the analyses. Since Spanish origin, or Hispanic, persons in the Census may be of any race, the non-Hispanic categories used were non-Hispanic Blacks, non-Hispanic Asians, and non-Hispanic Whites. The Asian category includes Pacific Islanders.

There are two additional census variables that are central to the study: English language proficiency and poverty status. The English proficiency measure was used to identify the limited English proficient adult population, and the poverty measure was used to define the portion of the limited English proficient population potentially in need of employment training and related services.

1. The Measure of English Proficiency

A measure of English proficiency was a primary variable needed for the study. To meet this need, an English proficiency scale was created from the following question that appeared on the 20 percent long form of the 1980 Census:

Q. 13.a. Does this person speak a language other than English at home?

- yes
- no, only speaks English

b. What is the language?

c. How well does this person speak English?

- very well
- well
- not well
- not at all

Excerpts from the 1980 Census PUMS Technical Documentation manual that further describe these questions are given below:

> **LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME.** Persons who speak a language other than English at home were asked to report the language spoken, as well as their proficiency in English.
>
> Respondents were instructed to report the language spoken most often for persons speaking two or more non-English languages at home, or the first language learned, where the language spoken most often could not be determined.

LANGUAGE USAGE AND ABILITY TO SPEAK ENGLISH. Persons 3 years old and over are classified by whether they speak a language other than English at home and, if so, by how well they speak English. Responses for persons under 3 are not tabulated. The classifications are:

- **Speaks Only English at Home.** Persons who always speak English at home. Includes persons who may speak a language other than English at school or elsewhere, but not at home, and persons whose usage of another language at home is limited to a few expressions or slang.

- **Speaks a Language Other Than English at Home.** Persons who speak a language other than English at home, even if English is spoken more frequently than the other language. They are further classified by level of English language ability.

  - Speak English very well. Persons who have no difficulty speaking English.

  - Speak English well. Persons who have only minor problems which do not seriously limit their ability to speak English.

  - Speak English not well. Persons who are seriously limited in their ability to speak English.

  - Speak English not at all.

The following five-point English proficiency scale was constructed from the above 1980 Census language questions:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Not Well	Well	Very Well	English only

The English proficiency scale proved to be useful for this research, but its limitations are readily apparent. The 1980 Census language questions rely on self-reporting; the questions are limited only to speaking and do not consider reading and writing English; and they only take into account language usage at home, not in other settings.

After some preliminary analysis, a decision was made to dichotomize the scale in order to estimate the number of persons who are English proficient and limited English proficient, and to make the projections more manageable. The point at which the scale was dichotomozed was based on the results of a study of the measure, the English Language Proficiency Study (ELPS), conducted by the U.S. Bureau of the Census for the U.S. Department of Education. One of the purposes of

the ELPS was to provide a count of limited English proficient adults for legislative and administrative purposes (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987:3).

As part of the ELPS, the Measure of Adult English Proficiency (MAEP) was used to test a national sample of 3,457 adults. The test measured receptive and productive skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The interview schedule used preceding the testing asked several questions that were identical to those asked in the 1980 Census so that the testing results could be linked to the census data and state estimates could be made.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census used the ELPS findings to estimate the limited English proficient adult population. Responses to the language usage question were compared to scores on the MAEP test. The results showed that the highest percentage of adults who failed the language test in the ELPS were in the following response categories of the 1980 Census language usage question: "not at all," "not well," and "well". The percentage in the "very well" category who failed the test were not significantly different from the percentage of persons in a comparison group who spoke English only and also failed the test. That is, generally the persons in the "very well" category did as well as the English only comparison group. The others did not do as well (Siegel, 1987). As a result, persons who scored 1,2, and 3 on the English proficiency scale were defined as limited English proficient, and those who scored 4 and 5 were defined as English proficient.

2. The Poverty Measure

The poverty measure used was taken from the 1980 Census. The measure was designed as an indicator of economic well-being based on the size, composition, and income of families, and is adjusted annually based on the consumer price index. The measure also takes into account the income of individuals not living in families. It is, therefore, a more useful indicator of economic well-being than family or individual income alone.

As with any indicator, the official government poverty measure has limitations and is somewhat controversial. Issues related to the poverty measure are covered extensively in the research literature. Most of the controversy

centers on the role transfer payments play in determining the extent of poverty, and determining the most justifiable income levels for establishing poverty levels. The poverty measure remains, however, an important and widely accepted social indicator.

Some of the advantages of using the poverty measure in this study are that: (1) it is widely used for describing and targeting "in need" and "at risk" populations, (2) it is used for distributing funds and for determining eligibility for services; (3) it takes into account families with multiple wage earners, as well as individuals; (4) it has been extensively studied; and (5) it can be linked to other census variables, such as limited English proficiency.

The poverty measure estimates economic poverty based on money income before taxes from all private and public sources including government transfer payments. In-kind government transfers, such as food stamps, Medicaid, and public housing, and in-kind private transfers, such as employer paid health insurance, are not included. Categories of the poverty measure used by the Bureau of the Census are:

Below poverty level:

- Below .75 times the poverty level (including no income or net loss)
- .75 to .99 times the poverty level

Above poverty level:

- 1.00 to 1.24 times the poverty level
- 1.25 to 1.49 times the poverty level
- 1.50 to 1.74 times the poverty level
- 1.75 to 1.99 times the poverty level
- 2.00 or more times the poverty level

Different poverty levels have been established based on the size and composition of families. For example, the poverty level was $7,412 in 1979 for a family of four.

For research purposes, the above poverty categories were aggregated as follows:

Below 1.25 times the poverty level
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level
2.00 or more times the poverty level

Table 2.1 shows the relationship between the poverty ranges and the median family income for the total U.S. population in 1979. The estimated income for a family of four at 1.24 times the poverty level was less than half the national median family income, whereas the estimated income at 1.99 times the poverty level was about three-quarters of the national median income.

TABLE 2.1

ESTIMATED POVERTY LEVEL INCOMES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE NATIONAL MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME FOR 1979

Poverty Status	Estimated Upper Level Income of the Poverty Range for a Family of Four	Estimated Upper Level Income of the Poverty Range as a Percentage of Median Family Income
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	$ 9,190	46.1
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level	$14,750	74.1
2.00 or more times the poverty level	NA	NA

Another way to look at the three poverty levels in Table 2.1 is in terms of their relationship to middle class family income. A method used by two U.S. Department of Labor economists, cited by Samuelson (1988), was to define middle class families as those having incomes between 68 and 190 percent of the median income. Using this methodology, middle class families would have had incomes between $13,544 and $37,842 in 1979. Thus, families whose incomes were at 1.99 of poverty ($14,750) would be at the very lowest end of the middle class, and the largest proportion of those in the 1.25 to 1.99 range would not be considered middle class.

The comparative description of the limited English proficient and English proficient adult populations in this chapter was conducted within this three-level poverty status framework. This framework is also used to describe the limited English proficient adults in need of employment training and related services in Chapter IV.

Presumably, persons most in need of assistance are those with the lowest incomes. In this study, they would be those below 1.25 times the poverty level. They are living in poverty. Those in the 1.25 to 1.99 range might be considered in a high risk group, where a downturn in the economy or a change in personal circumstances could jeopardize their marginal economic well-being.

B. Description of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population

In this section, characteristics of limited English proficient adults are described and compared to those of English proficient adults using variables in the 1980 Census. Data are presented by poverty status to add an economic dimension to the description.

Using the definition of limited English proficiency described earlier, the number of limited English proficient persons in this country, ages 16-64, was 6,302,600 in 1980. Individuals ages 16-24 not in school were excluded under the assumption that persons enrolled in school were either high school or college students and not in immediate need of vocational services. Limited English proficient adults comprised 4.3 percent of the total U.S. population, ages 16 to 64. Detailed data tables on the 16-64 year old population are presented in Appendix A and are referenced in the text.

1. Poverty Status, Sex, and Age (Tables A-1 and A-2)

Limited English proficient adults are much more likely than English proficient adults to live in poverty. They are more than twice as likely to have incomes below 1.25 times the poverty level (27.0 percent) as English proficient adults (12.4 percent). Furthermore, almost half of the limited English proficient adults (46.2 percent) are below 1.99 times the poverty level compared to about a quarter of the English proficient adults (24.4 percent). Another way of stating this is that almost twice the percentage of limited English proficient adults as English proficient adults make less than three-quarters of the national median family income. These findings are generally true for both males and females.

Since age is related to income, it is important to determine whether the differences in income between limited English and English proficient populations are due to differences in age. As shown in Table 2.2, the median age of limited English proficient adults is slightly higher than for English proficient adults. This relationship also holds for each category of poverty. Thus, age does not appear to explain the disparities in incomes between limited English proficient and English proficient adults.

TABLE 2.2

MEDIAN AGE OF LIMITED ENGLISH AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY POVERTY STATUS: 1980

Poverty Status	Median Age of Limited English Proficient Persons	Median Age of English Proficient Persons
All Persons	37.7 years	36.5 years
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	34.1	33.3
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level	35.2	33.3
2.00 and over times the poverty level	41.0	37.8

2. Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin (Table A-3 and A-4)

Well over half of limited English proficient adults are Hispanics (56.1 percent), and the majority of limited English proficient Hispanics are of Mexican origin (58.0 percent). Table 2.3 shows the limited English proficient adult population by racial/ethnic group. Hispanics include persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban origin and Other Hispanics. The second largest group of limited English proficient persons are White non-Hispanic (mostly of European origin) (27.4 percent). Another 12.7 percent of the limited English proficient population are Asian. Black non-Hispanics and Other Non-Hispanics comprise the smallest proportions of this population.

TABLE 2.3

RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS RANKED BY PERCENTAGE OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION: 1980

Race/Ethnicity	Percentage of Limited English Proficient Adult Population	Number (Ages 16-64*)
Mexican	32.4	2,039,400
White non-Hispanic	27.4	1,725,200
Asian	12.7	801,500
Other Hispanic	10.9	687,600
Puerto Rican	8.0	507,700
Cuban	4.7	299,600
Black non-Hispanic	2.2	136,400
Other non-Hispanic	1.7	105,200
TOTAL	100.0	6,302,600

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Overall, 69.3 percent of the limited English proficient adults living below 1.25 times the poverty level are Hispanic. Table 2.4 shows that the largest percentage of limited English proficient adults below 1.25 times the poverty level is of Mexican origin (41.4 percent). But the table also indicates the vulnerability of other groups to living in poverty. For example, while the "Other Non-Hispanic" category is small, it ranks highest in the percentage of limited English proficient adults living below 1.25 of poverty -- with almost half (48.8 percent) of the group below 1.25 times the poverty level. This group includes Native Americans, including American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. Lack of education and physical isolation as well as language are probably factors contributing to their poverty status.

Among Hispanic limited English proficient adults, Puerto Ricans have the highest percentage of persons in poverty (45.6 percent), followed by Mexicans (34.5 percent). Other Hispanics (mostly persons from Central and South America) and Cubans have lower rates of persons living in poverty (28.5 percent and 16.4 percent, respectively). This pattern follows closely the statistics on the educational level for these different Hispanic groups. At the time the 1980 Census was taken, persons from Central and South America and Cubans, on average, had higher educational levels than persons of Puerto Rican and Mexican origin (Davis, et al., 1983:29).

TABLE 2.4

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION BY PERCENTAGE OF RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP LIVING BELOW 1.25 TIMES THE POVERTY LEVEL: 1980

	Number of Persons Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	Overall Distribution of Poverty by Racial/ Ethnic Groups (Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level)*	Percentage of Persons Within Each Racial/Ethnic Group Living Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level**
Mexican	703,700	41.4	34.5
White non-Hispanic	258,800	15.2	15.0
Puerto Rican	231,500	13.6	45.6
Other Hispanic	194,200	11.4	28.5
Asian	171,200	10.1	21.4
Other non-Hispanic	51,400	3.0	48.8
Cuban	49,100	2.9	16.4
Black non-Hispanic	41,600	2.4	30.5
TOTAL	1,701,500	100.0	NA

*These are row percentages calculated by combining data from Tables A-3 and A-4, Appendix A.

**These are column percentages from Tables A-3 and A-4, Appendix A.

Of the remaining groups in Table 2.4, almost a third of the limited English proficient Black non-Hispanic population lives below 1.25 times the poverty level even though their numbers are small. By comparison, the White non-Hispanic population has the lowest percentage of any group living in poverty (15.0 percent), but this remains a sizeable percentage of the total limited English proficient population in poverty (15.2 percent).

Comparing the within-group differences among limited English proficient and English proficient adults of different racial/ethnic groups, we find that the relationship between English language proficiency and poverty status is stronger for some groups than for others. Overall, limited English proficient persons are more than twice as likely to be in poverty as English proficient persons. The rates for the various racial/ethnic groups are shown in Table 2.5.

3. **Geographic Distribution and Urbanicity** (Tables A-5 and A-6)

The limited English proficient population is concentrated in certain geographic areas. Table 2.6 shows the percentage geographic distribution of limited English proficient adults compared to English proficient adults in the four regions of the country. The western states contain the largest percentage of limited English proficient adults (34.4 percent). The data also indicate that the western states contain the largest percentage of the limited English proficient adult population living in poverty, while also containing the smallest percentage of English proficient adults living in poverty (Table 2.7). The data are similar for the northeast. This relationship is reversed in the South and the Midwest, where higher percentages of the nation's English proficient adults than limited English proficient adults live in poverty.

TABLE 2.5

PERCENTAGES OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS IN EACH RACIAL/ETHNIC CATEGORY BELOW 1.25 TIMES THE POVERTY LEVEL: 1980

Race/Ethnicity	Limited English Proficient	English Proficient
All Persons	27.0	12.4
All Hispanic	33.3	20.1
Mexican	34.5	20.2
Puerto Rican	45.6	29.2
Cuban	16.4	9.8
Other Hispanic	28.2	16.9
Asian	21.4	9.3
White non-Hispanic	15.0	9.8
Black non-Hispanic	30.5	29.8
Other non-Hispanic	48.8	23.0

TABLE 2.6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION: 1980

Geographic Region	Percent Limited English Proficient Adults (N= 6,302,600)	Percent English Proficient Adults (N = 120,818,200)
West	34.4	18.7
Northeast	28.2	21.5
South	25.0	33.5
Midwest	12.4	26.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Most of the limited English proficient adults below poverty in the West and South are of Mexican origin, and a large percentage of those in the Northeast are Puerto Ricans. Both of these limited English proficient populations have relatively low educational levels.

TABLE 2.7

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BELOW 1.25 TIMES THE POVERTY LEVEL BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION: 1980

Geographic Region	Adults Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	
	Percentage Limited English Proficient (N = 1,701,500)	Percentage English Proficient (N = 14,961,300)
West	35.1	17.1
South	29.6	41.4
Northeast	26.0	18.7
Midwest	9.3	22.8
Total	100.0	100.0

Almost 90 percent of the limited English proficient adults live in urban areas compared to 73 percent of the English proficient adults. Both populations do somewhat better economically in urban areas than in non-urban areas. About a quarter of the limited English proficient adults in urban areas and a third of these in non-urban areas live below 1.25 of poverty. Somewhat over 10 percent of the English proficient adults residing in urban areas are below 1.25 of poverty (Table A6, Appendix A).

4. **Year of Immigration and Citizenship** (Tables A-7 and A-8)

About two-thirds of the limited English proficient adults are foreign born (63.6 percent) and 46.6 percent are relatively recent immigrants having arrived in this country between 1965 and 1980.

Table 2.8 shows that the most recent immigrants are twice as likely to live below 1.25 times the poverty level as earlier immigrants. These differences may be due to the gradual economic assimilation of the limited English proficient population or to the characteristics of the people who immigrated at these various times, or both. Thirty percent of the native born limited English proficient adult population are below 1.25 times the poverty level. The native born limited English proficient adult population is discussed later in this chapter.

TABLE 2.8

PERCENTAGE OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BELOW 1.25 TIMES THE POVERTY LEVEL BY YEAR OF IMMIGRATION: 1980

Year of Immigration	Percent Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level
1975-80	35.8
1970-74	23.2
1965-69	20.1
1960-64	18.9
1950-59	15.2
Before 1950	18.4
Born in U.S.	30.0

Somewhat over half (55.4 percent) of the limited English proficient adults are citizens. Since many of the limited English proficient adults are recent immigrants, they may be in the process of applying for citizenship. Citizenship status does not appear to be significantly related to poverty (Table A-8, Appendix A).

5. **Education** (Tables A-9 and A-10)

The median educational level of limited English proficient adults is well below that of English proficient adults, as shown in Table 2.9. The median educational level for English proficient adults is equivalent to high school graduation, whereas the median educational level for the limited English proficient adults is equivalent to completing the first year of high school.

The median educational level for limited English proficient adults living below 1.25 and 1.25-1.99 times the poverty level is less than that for all limited English proficient persons. Additionally, limited English proficient adults at these poverty levels have lower median educational levels than their English

proficient counterparts, and the differences between limited English proficient and English proficient adults at these two poverty levels is larger than for the total groups. This may indicate a need for basic skills education as well as English language training.

TABLE 2.9

MEDIAN EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF LIMITED ENGLISH AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY POVERTY STATUS: 1980

	Median Educational Level	
Poverty Status	Limited English Proficient Persons	English Proficient Persons
All persons	9.4	12.1
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	7.9	11.5
1.25-1.99 times the poverty level	8.3	11.8
2.00 and over times the poverty level	11.1	12.2

There is no significant difference in the percentage of limited English proficient and English proficient persons between the ages of 25 and 64 enrolled in school. About four percent in both populations are enrolled (Table A-10, Appendix A).

6. **Labor Force Status** (Tables A-11 and A-12)

Limited English proficient males have slightly lower employment rates, slightly higher unemployment rates, and somewhat higher percentages of persons not in the labor force than English proficient males (Table 2.10). More than three-quarters (78.5 percent) of limited English proficient males are employed compared to 82.7 percent of English proficient males. Also, limited English proficient males have one percent higher unemployment rates than English proficient males, and 3.7 percent higher rates of persons not in the labor force.

TABLE 2.10

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT MALES, AGES 16-64, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS: 1980

Labor Force Status	Percent Limited English Proficient Males (N=2,987,800)	Percent English Proficient Males (N=58,191,000)
Employed	78.5	82.7
Unemployed	6.6	5.5
Armed Forces	.6	1.3
Not in Labor Force	14.2	10.5
Total	100.0	100.0

Limited English proficient males are much more likely to live in poverty than English proficient males regardless of labor force status (Table 2.11). The percentage of limited English proficient employed males living in poverty is almost three times that of English proficient employed males. Furthermore, limited English proficient males who are unemployed or not in the labor force are almost twice as likely as their English proficient counterparts to live in poverty. It is likely that limited English proficient males do not have personal savings or access to unemployment insurance and public assistance to the same extent as English proficient males, thus, putting them at higher risk when they are unemployed or not in the labor force.

A much lower percentage of limited English proficient females are employed (44.9 percent) than limited English proficient males (78.5 percent) or English proficient females (57.3 percent) (Table 2.12). Yet, limited English proficient females generally are less likely than limited English proficient males to have incomes below 1.25 times the poverty level whether they are employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force, possibly because a spouse is the primary support of the family in most cases (Table 2.13).

TABLE 2.11

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT MALES, AGES 16-64, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS AND POVERTY STATUS: 1980

Poverty Status	Percent Limited English Proficent Males (N=2,987,800)				Percent English Proficient Males (N=58,191,000)			
	Employed	Unemployed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Employed	Unemployed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force
Below 1.24 times the poverty level	19.7	35.4	22.6	50.1	6.7	19.2	12.9	30.8
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level	18.9	21.3	31.6	20.0	9.6	16.7	28.7	19.7
2.00 or more time the poverty level	61.3	43.3	45.8	29.9	83.7	64.1	58.4	49.5
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The percentage of unemployed limited English proficient females is somewhat higher than the percentage of English proficient females (4.9 percent vs. 3.7 percent). A large difference between the limited English proficient and the English proficient females are the percentages not in the labor force (50.1 percent and 38.9 percent, respectively). Limited English proficient females have higher birth rates than women in general (see Chapter III), probably indicating that they have more dependent children at home. This characteristic, in itself, may make it harder for them to work outside the home.

TABLE 2.12

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT FEMALES, AGES 16-64, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS: 1980

Labor Force Status	Percent Limit English Proficient Females (N=3,314,800)	Percent English Proficient Females (N=62,627,200)
Employed	44.9	57.3
Unemployed	4.9	3.7
Armed Forces	0.0	0.1
Not in Labor Force	50.1	38.9
Total	100.0	100.0

7.Household Type (Table A-13)

There is little difference in household types between limited English proficient and English proficient adults. Nearly 75 percent of the limited English proficient and the English proficient populations live in married couple households. A higher percentage of limited English proficient than English proficient males live in households with no wife present (5.0 percent vs. 2.5 percent). Limited English proficient females are slightly more likely to head

TABLE 2.13

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT FEMALES, AGES 16-64, BY LABOR FORCE STATUS AND POVERTY STATUS: 1980

Poverty Status	Percent Limited English Proficient Females (N=3,314,800)				Percent English Proficient Females (N=62,627,00)			
	Employed	Unemployed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Employed	Unemployed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force
Below 1.24 times the poverty level	16.8	30.4	42.9	39.2	8.9	26.2	4.2	21.9
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level	18.1	22.2	21.4	19.5	11.0	17.9	26.1	14.4
2.00 or more time the poverty level	65.1	47.3	35.7	41.3	80.1	55.9	69.7	63.7
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

households with no husband present than English proficient females (10.9 vs. 9.7). The reverse is true for non-family households where a somewhat higher percentage of English proficient persons than limited English proficient persons live alone or with other unrelated individuals (13.0 percent and 9.3 percent, respectively). Compared to the various household types, married couples in both populations are the least likely to live in poverty, whereas persons living in female headed households are the most likely to live in poverty (Table 2.14).

TABLE 2.14

PERCENTAGES OF LIMITED ENGLISH AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BELOW 1.25 TIMES THE POVERTY LEVEL BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE: 1980

Household Type	Percent Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	
	Limited English Proficient	English Proficient
All households	26.7	12.3
Married couple	22.1	7.7
Female householder no husband present	50.2	33.5
Male householder no wife present	27.6	16.9
Non-family household*	36.2	21.7

*Persons living alone or unrelated individuals living together.

8. Family Income and Earned Income (Tables A-14 and A-15)

Family income and earned income are other indications of economic well being. Family income is an indicator of group economic status. It is based on total money income of all family members. The number of family members, of course, affects the amount of family income. One way to raise family income is to increase the number of workers in a family. Earned income gives a better view of individual labor market worth. Earned income has been estimated by combining individual wages or salaries and non-farm and farm self-employment income. Several factors contribute to differences in earned income between limited English proficient and English proficient adults. Factors that appear in the literature are English proficiency, length of time in the United States, education, experience, type of occupation, region of the country, and consistency of employment.

Limited English proficient adults have lower family and earned incomes than English proficient adults, and females in both populations earn less than their male counterparts. Table 2.15 gives the median family and earned incomes for limited English and English proficient adults. The data show that the median family income of limited English proficient adults is about 25 percent lower than that of English proficient adults. Limited English proficient adults also have a lower median earned income. Compared to English proficient males, whose median earned income in 1979 was $16,157, limited English proficient males earn 33 percent less, limited English proficient females earn 58 percent less, and English proficient females earn 45 percent less.

TABLE 2.15

MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME AND EARNED INCOME FOR LIMITED ENGLISH AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS IN 1979

Language Proficiency	Median Family Income	Median Earned Income	
		Male	Female
Limited English Proficient	$17,252	$10,800	$6,817
English Proficient	$22,681	$16,157	$8,823

9. **Public Assistance**(Table A-16)

The vast majority (over 90 percent) of both the limited English and the English proficient adult populations did not receive public assistance in 1979. Limited English proficient adults, however, were 1.75 times more likely to receive public assistance (6.5 percent) than English proficient adults (3.7 percent). In sheer numbers, eleven times as many English proficient as limited English proficient adults received public assistance.

Limited English proficient females were 1.67 times as likely as English proficient females to receive public assistance, and limited English proficient males were twice as likely as English proficient males to receive assistance. While it is not possible to determine the type of assistance received from the 1980 Census, some of the limited English proficient adults may have been receiving refugee assistance.

10. **Total Hours Worked in 1979**

English proficient adults worked somewhat more hours in 1979 than limited English proficient adults, and males in both populations worked more hours than females. Table 2.16 indicates that, compared to English proficient males, limited English proficient males work 3.6 percent less hours, English proficient females work 15.0 percent less, and limited English proficient females work 18.9 percent less.

TABLE 2.16

MEDIAN HOURS WORKED IN 1979 FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY SEX

	Median Hours Worked in 1979	
Sex	Limited English Proficient Persons	English Proficient Persons
Male	2,031	2,107
Female	1,709	1,790

Persons living in poverty work the least number of hours, and income above the poverty level increases as the number of hours worked increases. Table 2.17 shows that the median number of hours worked in 1979 for both limited English and English proficient males is lowest for those below 1.25 times the poverty level, but income above the poverty level increases as the number of hours worked increases.

TABLE 2.17

MEDIAN HOURS WORKED IN 1979 FOR LIMITED ENGLISH AND ENGLISH PROFICIENT MALES BY POVERTY STATUS

Poverty Status	Median Hours Worked in 1979	
	Limited English Proficient Males	English Proficient Males
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	1,604	1,587
1.25 to 1.99 times the poverty level	1,994	2,005
2.00 and over times the poverty level	2,084	2,132

11. **Characteristics of Native Born Limited English Proficient Adults** (Table A-17)

An estimated 2,338,900 or 36.4 percent of the limited English proficient adult population is native born. This population has a median age of 39.0 years, which is 1.3 years older than the total limited English proficient adult population. Almost two-thirds (60.3 percent) are Hispanic. Another 30.1 percent are White non-Hispanic. Of the Hispanics, 56.6 percent are of Mexican origin, and 34.8 percent are of Puerto Rican origin.

The native born limited English proficient adult population is most heavily concentrated in the southern region of the country (32.9 percent). Another 28.7 percent live in the northeastern region, and 25.6 percent live in the western region. The midwest has the lowest percentage of native born limited English proficient adults (12.8 percent).

Just over half (52.6 percent) of this native born population are female. Most native born limited English proficient adults live in married couple households (70.7 percent), but a relatively high percentage live in female headed households with no husband present (15.0 percent). Another 10.3 percent live in non-family households.

The native born limited English proficient adult population has a relatively low median educational level (9.8 median years), as does the limited English proficient adult population as a whole. The native born population also tends to do less well economically than the English proficient adult population. Thirty percent live below 1.25 times the poverty level, and 10.4 percent receive some type of public assistance. This rate of public assistance is 3.9 percentage points higher than the rate for the total limited English proficient adult population and 6.7 percentage points higher than the rate for the English proficient adult population.

The percentage of native born limited English proficient adults who were employed was 55.3 percent. Another 5.4 percent were unemployed, and 38.0 percent were not in the labor force. For those who are in the labor force, the median number of hours worked in 1979 was 1,957. The median earned income was $8,467, and the median household income was $15,300 in 1979.

These findings show that over one-third of limited English proficient adults are at least second generation in this country. It is possible that these native born limited English proficient persons live in ethnic enclaves where their native language is predominant, permitting them to survive socially and, to some extent, economically. The low educational level of this population suggests that their contact with a predominatly English language school system was minimal and was not influential enough to cause some shift to English.

Using the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Veltman (1988:46-49) identified a small, but significant number of native born Hispanic limited English proficient persons. He postulated that these people live in regions with high concentrations of Hispanics. Using the 1976 data to investigate the likelihood of

language shift in different regions of the country among these native born, he found that Hispanics in Texas and New Mexico were less likely than those in other regions of the country to make some shift to English by becoming bilingual. These findings are understandable since both Texas and New Mexico are border states which at one time belonged to Mexico. Many of the residents in those states, therefore, identify with the Hispanic culture. California also has a large Hispanic population, but the state has a large number of other non-English language groups as well. Veltman's research indicates that the rate of Spanish monolingualism among native born persons in California is not as high as it is in Texas and New Mexico. However, his research suggests that the rate will increase in California as Hispanic immigration into the state increases.

C. Summary

Limited English proficient adults are more than twice as likely as English proficient adults to live in poverty, and limited English proficient females are slightly more likely than limited English proficient males to live in poverty. The median ages of the limited English and the English proficient adults are about the same, but the median ages of persons living in poverty are younger than persons who do not live in poverty in both populations.

Well over half of the limited English proficient population is Hispanic, and the majority of limited English proficient Hispanics are of Mexican origin. Another third are White non-Hispanic and about an eighth are Asian. Black non-Hispanics and Other non-Hispanics (mostly Native Americans) comprise small percentages of the total limited English proficient population. Even though the Other non-Hispanic and Puerto Rican categories have relatively small numbers, they have the highest rates of limited English proficient persons living in poverty.

One-third of the limited English proficient population lives in the West. The next highest concentration live in the Northeast, and about a quarter live in the South. In the West and Northeast regions of the country, higher percentages of limited English proficient than English proficient adults live in poverty. The reverse is true in the South and Midwest regions, where there are larger percentages of English proficient than limited English proficient adults living in

poverty. By far the majority of limited English proficient adults live in urban areas, and they tend to do better economically in these areas than in non-urban areas.

About two-thirds of the limited English proficient adults are foreign born and less than half are citizens. Poverty appears to be associated with recency of immigration, but close to one-third of the native born, limited English proficient adults live in poverty.

The median educational level of English proficient adults is 2.7 grades higher than for limited English proficient adults, and the median educational level is lower for persons living in poverty in both populations than those living above the poverty level. Four percent of both limited English proficient and English proficient adults over the age of 25 were enrolled in school in 1980. Limited English proficient persons over 25 who were enrolled in school in 1980 were slightly more likely to live in poverty than persons who were not enrolled in school.

Limited English proficient males have slightly lower employment rates, slightly higher unemployment rates, and somewhat higher percentages of persons not in the labor force than English proficient males. But there are three times the percentage of limited English as English proficient employed males living in poverty. Furthermore, limited English proficient males who are unemployed or not in the labor force are almost twice as likely as their English proficient counterparts to live in poverty. Limited English proficient females have much lower employment rates than both limited English proficient males and 12.4 percentage points lower than the rates for English proficient females.

Limited English proficient adults have lower incomes than English proficient adults, and females in both populations earn less than their male counterparts. Limited English proficient males have a median earned income that is 33 percent less than the median earned income of English proficient males, and limited English proficient females have a median earned income that is 58 percent less than that of English proficient males.

Only small percentages of the limited English and the English proficient adult populations received public assistance in 1979. Limited English proficient adults, however, were 1.75 times more likely to receive public assistance than English proficient adults, but there were eleven times as many English proficient as limited English proficient adults receiving public assistance.

English proficient adults worked somewhat more hours in 1979 than limited English proficient adults, and males in both populations worked more hours than females. Persons living in poverty worked the least number of hours, and status above poverty increases as the number of hours worked increases.

Over one-third of limited English proficient adults are native born, and they have a median age of 39.0 years. The largest percentage are Hispanic, most of whom are of Mexican or Puerto Rican origin. Another third are White non-Hispanic. The native born limited English proficient adult population tends to be somewhat more female than male, has somewhat higher percentages of female headed households than the total limited English proficient adult population, has a relatively low level of education, and a comparatively high percentage of persons receiving public assistance. Almost one-third live in poverty, and close to forty percent are not in the labor force.

III. PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION TO THE YEAR 2000

The purpose of this chapter is to report demographic projections to the year 2000 of the limited English proficient population in the United States, ages 16-64. Since it is possible to derive estimates of the limited English proficient populations by age and sex for the base year from the 1980 Census, the cohort-component method (Shryock and Siegel, 1973) was used for the projections. This method incorporates the age and sex specific projection of the population, taking into account changes in those groups resulting from fertility, mortality and migration.

A. Projection Procedures

The cohort-component method projects a population by cohorts, that is, individual age cohorts such as males 5-9 years of age, females 15-19, etc. for the separate components of change. All cohorts are subject to the effects of mortality during the projection period, but since death rates increase with age and vary by sex, the proportion of a population dying each year will vary dependent upon the distribution of the population across age and sex groups. The cohort-component method, by definition, takes those variations into account by treating each group distinctly. Thus, a population with a greater proportion of older persons will have more deaths each year than a "younger" population.

Each age group is projected forward in five year intervals by the use of survival rates. Survival rates are directly calculated from life tables which, in turn, derive from the mortality experience of the population itself. The basic formula for the survival of each age-sex group is as follows:

(1) $$P(t+5)_{x+5} = P(t)_x * S(x,x+5), \text{ where}$$

P = the age group at time t,t+5 and age x,x+5 and
S = the survival rate from age x to age x + 5.

Thus, to project an age group of 18,000 persons for a five year period using an appropriate survival rate:

(2) $18{,}000 * .99876 = 17{,}978.$

Migration often plays a key role in population change. This is especially true for the limited English proficient population which receives many new members each year via international immigration. Migration will cause an increase or decrease in a particular age-sex group on a net basis. That is, some persons will immigrate while others depart the country by emigrating. Net immigration is added to each age/sex group based upon the assumptions on their numbers used in the projection.

The third component of change, fertility, will determine the youngest five year age group in the population, those aged 0-4. This group is projected in a two stage process. First, the annual number of births is calculated using fertility rates specific to each five year age group of women in the childbearing ages (15 - 49). Second, the new births are subject to the same survival process noted in formula (1) above using infant and child survival rates.

The cohort component method, then, produces results which are mathematically quite accurate in that variations in a population's age and sex distribution are inherently compensated for. Projection requirements are a base population age-sex distribution, age-specific fertility rates, schedules of life table survival rates, and immigration data upon which assumptions can be based.

B. Base Population

The benchmark population used for the starting point of the projections was the 1980 Census which asked a 20 percent sample of all persons the question on language usage at home described earlier in Chapter II. As previously stated, the 16-64 year old population was dichotomized into limited English and English proficient persons using the five point English proficiency scale derived from the language usage question. The 16-24 year olds enrolled in school are included in the projections.

Given the relative paucity of data in the published 1980 Census volumes, tabulations of the limited English proficient populations were obtained directly from the 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Samples (PUMS) computer tapes. It is important to reiterate that Spanish origin, or Hispanic, persons may be of any race; the tabulations given in Table 3.1 are adjusted from published Census tables to account for that fact. Therefore, the race categories, "Blacks, Asian and Pacific Islanders, and Whites" are actually "non-Hispanic Blacks, non-Hispanic Asians, and non-Hispanic Whites" in all text and tables.

As can be seen in Table 3.1, in 1980 there were about 1.9 million White non-Hispanic, 3.8 million Hispanic, 900,000 Asian, and about 168,000 Black non-Hispanic limited English proficient persons in ages 16-64. The relatively small number of Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics is a direct result of low immigration levels from the countries of origin of those groups. There have never been significant streams of immigration from the countries of Africa, although there are indications of a gradual increase in the numbers of immigrants from those countries. Immigration from the traditional source countries of Europe has declined to very low levels, reducing the potential for new White non-Hispanic limited English proficient immigrants.

Data for the age group 0-4 in 1980 are not given in the Census data since language ability is not pertinent for this young population. This age group was estimated using child-woman ratios (CWR's) from published census tables on language use of parents (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1984). The child-woman ratio is the ratio of children ages 0-4 to women in the childbearing age groups in the particular population.

C. Projection Components

Populations change only by the three fundamental demographic components of fertility, mortality, and migration. Treatment of these components form the basis for the projection process as a series of assumptions. The validity of the assumptions will be affected by several factors: the availability of data upon which they can be based and the length of the projection period itself. These considerations are treated in turn in the appropriate sections below.

TABLE 3.1
LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT POPULATION BY RACE/ETHNICITY, AGE, AND SEX: 1980

Age	HISPANIC		ASIAN		BLACK		WHITE		TOTAL	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
16-19	202,560	175,520	35,360	26,640	9,120	11,520	66,160	61,920	313,200	275,600
20-24	298,400	263,400	54,100	57,300	15,300	13,600	95,100	82,300	462,900	416,600
25-29	280,000	270,200	66,600	82,000	13,500	13,600	89,900	86,200	450,000	452,000
30-34	235,500	256,300	62,000	84,900	11,900	11,500	90,200	85,600	399,600	438,300
35-39	185,700	213,500	48,200	56,000	8,300	7,800	76,400	82,500	318,600	359,800
40-44	170,300	197,900	41,100	52,300	7,400	7,700	79,900	87,400	298,700	345,300
45-49	155,900	183,700	30,100	40,700	4,500	6,100	84,600	99,400	275,100	329,900
50-54	141,400	162,900	26,000	39,800	5,000	4,900	105,600	117,900	278,000	325,500
55-59	115,900	131,800	24,200	32,900	3,900	5,100	120,700	144,200	264,700	314,000
60-64	79,500	100,300	19,000	26,400	2,900	4,300	109,900	121,200	211,300	252,200
Total	1,865,160	1,955,520	406,660	498,940	81,820	86,120	918,460	968,620	3,272,100	3,509,200
Both Sexes	3,820,680		905,600		167,940		1,887,080		6,781,300	

Source: 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Samples

Note: Hispanics may be of any race; Asian, Black, and White groups exclude Hispanics; Asians include Pacific Islander category.

1. Fertility

For this task, the role of fertility in the projections is greatly reduced, since the population is limited to ages 16 to 64 and the time period from 1980 to 2000. For that reason, only four-fifths of the births occurring during the period 1980-1985 will, in fact, be included in the study population in the fourth time period of the projections, 1995-2000.

Fertility data and estimates are readily available for the racial/ethnic groups to be projected from standard sources. For Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics, registered data are collected and tabulated annually by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) as a part of the vital statistics system (NCHS,1982). NCHS has been collecting data on Hispanic births since 1978, an important gap in U.S. vital statistics that has now been filled (NCHS, 1983). For Asians, NCHS published fertility data for 1980, allowing for a basis for reliable estimates (NCHS, 1984).

The fertility measure used for the projection assumption is the total fertility rate (TFR), or the average number of children born to women during their lifetimes. In the United States during 1987, the TFR was 1.9 for all women. Although overall estimates for each racial/ethnic group can be derived from published data, it was expected that limited English proficient women would likely have somewhat higher birth rates than the general population, an expectation based upon recency of immigration and lower socioeconomic status. This was confirmed by calculating child-woman ratios (CWR's), a measure which compares the number of children ages 0-4 to the number of women in the childbearing ages. Based upon the CWR's, TFR's for 1985 period were estimated to be 2.8 for Hispanics, 2.3 for Black non-Hispanics, 2.5 for Asians, and 2.3 for White non-Hispanics. Since no births occurring in 1985 or later are relevant to the study population 16-64, no assumption on future fertility was required.

2. Mortality

Given high levels of life expectancy and low infant mortality, mortality will have relatively little effect upon change in the limited English proficient population. This is particularly true since the population is restricted to the 16-64 age range.

As with fertility, good estimates of mortality are available for each group from vital statistics and Census Bureau projections. Official life expectancies for White non-Hispanics and Black non-Hispanics in the total population were used for 1980, 78 years for White non-Hispanic females and 71 for White non-Hispanic males, 73 for Black non-Hispanic females and 64 for Black non-Hispanic males (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986a). Life expectancies for Hispanics were the same as the values used in U.S. Census Bureau projections, 79 for Hispanic females and 72 for Hispanic males (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986b); since life expectancy data for Asians is lacking, this group was assigned the same value as for Hispanics, an assumption made more plausible by the large number of recent immigrants in the limited English proficient Asian population.

Assumptions as to future life expectancy follow the same pattern as that used in Census Bureau projections. For White non-Hispanic females, life expectancy was assumed to rise to 81 years by 2000 and to 73 for White non-Hispanic males. Corresponding assumptions for the other groups are as follows: Black non-Hispanic females, 77, Black non-Hispanic males, 68, Hispanic and Asian females, 81, and, for males, 74 years.

3. Immigration

Published and unpublished data are available on legal immigrants, refugees, and asylees from the Immigration and Naturalization Service(INS) through 1986 (INS, 1981; INS, no date). While racial/ethnic data as such are not collected on immigrants, data on country of origin can be used to closely approximate immigrant flows by race and ethnicity.

Hispanic immigrant flows were accumulated by summing immigrants from Spain, Central America, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and South America less Guyana and Brazil. Black immigrants are assumed to originate in sub-Saharan Africa and the Caribbean less Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Immigrants from Asia and Oceania less Australia and New Zealand were classified as Asian and Pacific Islander. All other immigrants were considered to be White non-Hispanic.

For the period 1980-1985, actual data may, of course, be used. The amount of immigration in this period was the total of legal immigrants, refugees, and asylees reported by the INS. These data were adjusted for the fact that the INS reports data for Fiscal Years. For future assumptions, reported immigrants, refugees, and asylees for the most recent three year period, FY 1984-1986, were averaged and assumed to represent a reasonable prospect for the 1985 - 2000 period. Since the distribution of legal immigrants by region of origin has remained relatively stable in recent years, this assumption appears justified.

Several adjustments were made to the basic immigration data before they were incorporated in the projections. First, an additional amount was added for net illegal immigration. A sound basis for such an assumption now exists, that being the assumptions now used by the Census Bureau of 300,000 per year. Of that amount, the Bureau estimates that 212,000 undocumented immigrants are of Hispanic origin. The balance was proportionally distributed across the remaining three racial/ethnic groups. Additionally, an allowance was made for emigration, estimated to total 160,000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986b). This amount was also distributed proportionally. For the Hispanic population, an additional 125,000 immigrants of the Mariel Sealift were included for the 1980-1985 period. These immigrants arrived shortly after the 1980 Census and, thus, were by definition excluded from the base population.

The final adjustment to the immigrant assumptions needed to be made for limited English proficient status, that is, what proportion of these immigrants were limited English proficient? While it might not be unreasonable to assume that all immigrants would experience some difficulty with English, Census data on limited English proficient status by year of immigration exist and these data were obtained from the PUMS tape. It was, then, assumed that future immigrants would be as likely to be limited English proficient as were immigrants in the 1975-1980 period in the Census data.

Assumptions on the numbers of immigrants used in the projections are shown in Table 3.2. It should be emphasized that these are annual numbers of immigrants.

TABLE 3.2

REPORTED AND ASSUMED IMMIGRATION OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS PER YEAR BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP: 1980-1985 and 1995-2000

	Race/Ethnicity			
Year	Hispanic	Asian	Black non-Hispanic	White non-Hispanic
1980-1985	325,049	218,102	11,310	43,758
1995-2000	313,765	193,050	10,069	42,862

Source: INS data

D. Projection Results

The resultant projections, for total limited English proficient persons by racial/ethnic group, are provided in Table 3.3. Details are presented in Tables B-1 to B-5, Appendix B. These projections were derived principally from the 1980 base population with immigration accounting for virtually all of the potential growth. For that reason, the projections represent a maximum number of limited English proficient persons and potential limited English proficient persons which may reasonably be expected by the year 2000. Over the twenty year period, it is likely that the actual number of limited English proficient adults would be reduced by assimilation, that is, by the attainment of English proficiency. No data, however, exist upon which to project an anticipated rate of assimilation for a particular cohort. Therefore, the projections provide a potential "pool" of future limited English proficient adults without regard to any future changes in status.

E. Reduction of the Limited English Proficient Population by Attainment of English Proficiency

Some indication of the rate at which limited English proficient persons become proficient in English can be gleaned from past experience. Since the 1980 Census asked a question on year of immigration, it is possible to compare the percentage of limited English proficient persons by age groups with differing intervals of time since their date of immigration.

TABLE 3.3

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT POPULATION, AGES 16-64,
BY RACE/ETHNICITY: 1980-2000

Race/Ethnicity	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
Hispanic	3,820,680	5,285,558	6,881,695	8,603,143	10,477,585
Asian	905,600	1,726,122	2,520,955	3,374,828	4,290,092
Black non-Hispanic	167,940	229,514	286,517	343,194	407,164
White non-Hispanic	1,887,080	1,915,129	1,937,575	2,062,904	2,253,440
Total	6,781,300	9,156,323	11,626,742	14,384,068	17,428,281

Table 3.4 presents estimates of the percentage of limited English proficient persons given longer periods of residence in the United States. Since the Census did collect information on year of immigration, tables can be generated showing the percentage of limited English proficient persons for each age group and period of immigration. But, since, the Census can only gather data at one point in time, no longitudinal analysis of a cohort is possible. For example, while, the percentage of limited English proficient persons for those aged 25-29 in 1980 who immigrated in 1970-1974 can be obtained, the percentage of limited English proficient persons for that group when they immigrated cannot specifically be determined.

It is possible, however, to analyze the acquisition of English proficiency by using synthetic cohorts in a cross-sectional approach. With that method, different cohorts are treated as if they were the same cohort passing through time. For example, the comparison of the percentage of limited English proficient persons among the 25-29 age group in 1980 who immigrated in 1975-1980 to the percentage of limited English proficient persons of those 30-34 who immigrated in 1970-1974 contains a strong suggestion of the rate at which English ability is gained with increasing length of residence. Estimates of the percentage of limited English proficient persons using this method are shown in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 suggests that the likelihood that English proficiency will be gained is greatest during the first ten-year period following immigration. Beyond that point, the tendency to remain in the limited English proficient population

increases. Again, it should be kept in mind that each age "cohort" in the table is comprised of different five year age groups at the time of the 1980 Census. To the extent that the composition of the immigration cohorts had differing characteristics from 1960 to 1980, the analytical value of the table will be diminished. This situation points to the need for a special survey designed to measure the progress of individual limited English proficient immigrant cohorts as the interval from the date of immigration increases.

The above findings are reinforced by Veltman's work on language shift among Hispanics using the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (Veltman, 1988: 40-44). He found that there is virtually no language shift from Spanish to English after a person has been in this country fifteen years.

He also found that age is related to language transition. The younger school age immigrants learn English faster then older immigrants, probably due to being in school. Other research suggests, however, that lack of English proficiency may be an important contributor to the high drop-out rates among Hispanic adolescents (Fields, 1988:22). But Veltman's research indicates that there is another surge in rates of language shift as Hispanics reach their late teens and early twenties and enter the workforce (Veltman, 1988:47).

Just as limited English proficient immigrants may gain English proficiency with time, so may native born limited English proficient persons. Table 3.5 shows the percentage of limited English proficient persons in the native born population by age in 1980. The data in this table are, of course, for the actual age cohorts in 1980 since the use of synthetic cohort analysis was, by definition, not necessary. Contained within the data are indications of how well limited English proficient persons have assimilated (using English language as the criterion) over the years, comparing those who passed through the educational system decades ago with younger groups. It can be seen from the data that Hispanics have higher rates of limited English proficient persons across all age groups compared to persons in the other racial/ethnic categories.

TABLE 3.4

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS BY YEARS SINCE IMMIGRATION, BY AGE IN 1980 AND RACE/ETHNICITY

Hispanic

Age in 1980	Actual Percent Limited English Proficient (1975-1980) 1-5 yrs.	Estimated Percent Limited English Proficient (1970-1974) 6-10 yrs.	(1969-1965) 11-15 yrs.	(1960-1964) 16-20 yrs.
5-9	75.5	45.2	30.0	20.4
10-14	72.4	45.5	41.1	27.1
15-19	82.9	68.6	59.9	42.2
20-24	85.0	78.8	70.7	58.9
25-29	82.8	80.7	73.3	66.9
30-34	83.5	83.1	81.2	72.1
35-39	87.3	87.4	82.3	80.0
40-44	87.6	87.7	87.5	81.3
45-49	92.1	90.5	88.7	86.0
50-54	88.7	88.3	92.7	-
55-59	89.0	89.1	-	-
60-64	86.3	-	-	-

Asian

Age in 1980	Actual Percent Limited English Proficient (1975-1980) 1-5 yrs.	Estimated Percent Limited English Proficient (1970-1974) 6-10 yrs.	(1969-1965) 11-15 yrs.	(1960-1964) 16-20 yrs.
5-9	62.0	18.6	7.4	15.3
10-14	58.1	31.2	22.7	25.9
15-19	66.4	40.9	40.1	24.6
20-24	65.2	44.0	33.6	36.4
25-29	64.5	39.9	29.3	35.2
30-34	65.8	45.8	39.1	44.0
35-39	67.0	46.8	40.9	60.6
40-44	72.7	59.9	57.0	68.1
45-49	76.7	68.9	70.2	69.6
50-54	84.0	82.3	85.4	-
55-59	83.3	76.0	-	-
60-64	78.1	-	-	-

TABLE 3.4 (Con't)

	Black non-Hispanic Years Since Immigration			
	Actual Percent Limited English Proficient (1975-1980)	Estimated Percent Limited English Proficient (1970-1974)	(1969-1965)	(1960-1964)
	1-5 yrs.	6-10 yrs.	11-15 yrs.	16-20 yrs.
Age in 1980				
5-9	10.4	9.9	6.0	4.9
10-14	5.3	9.7	5.3	2.5
15-19	7.7	10.8	9.3	2.7
20-24	16.7	15.3	6.9	12.0
25-29	20.3	14.2	13.2	17.6
30-34	27.9	13.3	18.1	6.9
35-39	17.8	16.5	8.5	63.6
40-44	30.9	11.4	8.1	83.3
45-49	76.9	15.5	27.1	15.0
50-54	12.5	9.3	33.3	-
55-59	19.0	66.6	-	-
60-64	3.9	-	-	-

	White non-Hispanic Years Since Immigration			
	Actual Percent Limited English Proficient (1975-1980)	Estimated Percent Limited English Proficient (1970-1974)	(1969-1965)	(1960-1964)
	1-5 yrs.	6-10 yrs.	11-15 yrs.	16-20 yrs.
Age in 1980				
5-9	31.4	16.6	5.5	4.5
10-14	35.8	16.0	10.1	6.2
15-19	43.0	32.3	23.3	19.3
20-24	49.5	34.4	28.8	18.2
25-29	46.6	34.5	30.6	20.8
30-34	38.7	34.3	28.8	28.7
35-39	41.6	57.6	57.2	31.7
40-44	30.9	11.4	8.1	83.3
45-49	58.5	69.8	59.3	51.6
50-54	63.1	73.3	57.5	-
55-59	55.5	55.7	-	-
60-64	51.0	-	-	-

Dash (-) means not applicable
Source: 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Samples

TABLE 3.5

PERCENTAGE OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS BY AGE IN 1980 AND RACE/ETHNICITY FOR THE NATIVE BORN POPULATION

	Racial/Ethnic Group			
	Hispanic	Asian	Black non-Hispanic	White non-Hispanic
Age in 1980				
5-9	33.0	12.8	0.7	0.8
10-14	23.6	7.0	0.7	0.5
15-19	20.4	6.1	0.7	0.7
20-24	21.2	6.3	0.7	0.6
25-29	23.0	5.9	0.6	0.5
30-34	25.8	5.2	0.6	0.5
35-39	30.0	4.8	0.6	0.5
40-44	33.3	8.0	0.6	0.5
45-49	37.9	12.2	0.5	0.6
50-54	40.3	13.8	0.5	0.9
55-59	41.9	18.3	0.6	1.2
60-64	44.9	21.3	0.6	1.5

Source: 1980 Census Public Use Microdata Samples

F. Summary

The cohort-component method was used to project the limited English proficient population to the year 2000. These projections were for five year age groups within the 16-64 year old population by sex and race/ethnicity. The racial/ethnic categories used in the projections were Hispanic, Black non-Hispanic, Asian and Pacific Islander, and White non-Hispanic. These are mutually exclusive categories. Hispanics may be of any race; the Asian, Black, and White categories exclude Hispanics; and Asians include Pacific Islanders.

The cohort-component method relies on three components of change - fertility, mortality, and migration. Of the three, migration plays the most central role in projecting the limited English proficient population. The projections take into account net migration of legal immigrants, refugees, and asylees as well as net illegal immigration.

The potential "pool" of limited English proficient adults are estimated to be about 17.4 million by the year 2000, compared to 6.8 million estimated from the 1980 Census. This "pool" is expected to become proportionally more Hispanic and Asian/Pacific Islander and less White European by the year 2000. The low rate of immigration from Africa is not expected to change. The limited English proficient adult population in 1980 is estimated to be 56.3 percent Hispanic, 27.8 percent White non-Hispanic, 13.3 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2.5 percent Black non-Hispanic. By the year 2000, this distribution is anticipated to be 60.1 percent Hispanic, 24.6 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 12.9 percent White non-Hispanic, and 2.3 percent Black non-Hispanic.

Over the twenty year period between 1980 and 2000, some of this limited English proficient "pool" are expected to become English proficient, thus, reducing the size of the limited English proficient "pool". There are no data available to project the rate of assimilation by age cohorts, and it is beyond the scope of this study to do so. But a preliminary cross-sectional analysis of the 1980

Census data by age and year of immigration suggest that the likelihood of gaining English proficiency is greatest during the first ten years following immigration. After this, the likelihood of remaining limited English proficient increases. The data indicate that the Hispanic population, as a whole, both immigrants and native born, have higher rates of persons who are limited English proficient across all age groups compared to persons in the other racial/ethnic categories.

IV. PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION IN NEED OF EMPLOYMENT TRAINING: 1990 AND 2000

This chapter presents projections to the years 1990 and 2000 of the limited English proficient adult population, ages 16-64, in need of employment training and related services. Youth who may be enrolled in school are included in the projections because of the high drop-out rates found within certain sub-groups of this population. The main tools for carrying out these projections were the poverty status measures discussed in Chapter II and the population projections presented in Chapter III.

A. Procedures

To recapitulate from Chapter II, the poverty measure in the 1980 Census was used to assess the economic well-being of the limited English proficient adult population. The poverty measure has several advantages that make it useful for this study. Among these are that it takes into account family size and composition as well as individuals not living in families, and it includes all sources of income. One of the measure's limitations for this study is that it includes transfer or welfare payments, such as AFDC, but does not include in-kind government transfers, such as food stamps, Medicaid, and public housing. As a result, an individual or family may be above the poverty level as a function of transfer payments and may, additionally, be receiving in-kind government transfers. Without this government assistance, many more may fall below the poverty level than are indicated by the numbers presented here.

One of the main purposes for providing employment training is to assist limited English proficient adults to become self-sufficient and to maintain self-sufficiency so they will not be dependent on government assistance. The poverty measure, therefore, is useful for defining the limited English proficient adult population at risk, as well as those who are potentially at risk.

Our analysis focuses on two groups of 16-64 year old limited English proficient persons, those who are below 1.25 times the poverty level and those 1.25-1.99 times the poverty level. We refer to persons below 1.25 times the poverty level as the "most at risk." The 1.25 to 1.99 category includes a mix of limited English proficient adults. Some are doing reasonably well, but all have family incomes well below the national median. Given their limited English proficiency and low educational levels, many may be marginal, lacking the human capital to sustain full employment at an earnings level that is adequate for maintaining self-sufficiency. Persons in this category are referred to as "potentially at risk."

The projections of persons in need of training were obtained by using the 1980 demographic specific poverty rates and applying them to the population projections presented in Chapter III. An assumption underlying this projection is that the poverty rates will not change significantly in the twenty year period from 1980 to 2000. Gottschalk and Danziger predict that the poverty rates will continue at about the current level for the next several years based on trends in economic growth, unemployment rates, and income transfers (Gottschalk and Danziger, 1984:186). If this prediction holds true, then projected demographic changes in the population will be the major determining factor in the number of persons in poverty.

Trends in the poverty rates shown in Table 4.1 indicate that the poverty rates for the total population and Hispanic populations between 1980 and 1987 changed by only .5 percent, even though the rates fluctuated somewhat in individual years. The biggest change was the increase in absolute numbers. The total number of persons below the poverty level increased by 10.0 percent, and the Hispanic population below poverty grew by 36.2 percent between 1980 and 1987. The limited English proficient adult population is a subset of the numbers in Table 4.1. Comparable poverty trends were not available for other language minorities, such as Asians and American Indians.

Based on the research literature, we assume that the majority of limited English proficient adults will not realize earnings gains equivalent to native born persons during the 20 years between 1980 and 2000, and we also assume that the

TABLE 4.1
NUMBER OF PERSONS BELOW THE POVERTY LEVEL AND POVERTY RATE
FOR THE TOTAL U.S. POPULATION
AND FOR PERSONS OF SPANISH ORIGIN: 1973-1987

	Total Population		Spanish Origin	
Year	No. Below the Poverty Level	Poverty Rate	No. Below the Poverty Level	Poverty Rate
1987	32,546	13.5	5,470	28.2
1986	32,370	13.6	5,117	27.3
1985	33,064	14.0	5,236	29.0
1984	33,700	14.4	4,806	28.4
1983	35,303	15.2	4,633	28.0
1982	34,398	15.0	4,301	29.9
1981	31,822	14.0	3,713	26.5
1980	29,272	13.0	3,491	27.7
1979	26,072	11.7	2,921	21.8
1978	24,497	11.4	2,607	21.6
1977	24,720	11.6	2,700	22.4
1976	24,975	11.8	2,783	24.7
1975	25,877	12.3	2,991	26.9
1974	23,370	11.2	2,575	23.0
1973	22,973	11.1	2,366	21.9

Source: Years 1973 to 1985 excerpted from U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983). Poverty in the United States: 1985, Series P-60, No. 158. Washington: D.C.: USGPO; Table A, p.2; Years 1986 and 1987 obtained from the Poverty and Wealth Branch, U.S. Bureau of the Census, September 2, 1988.

economic status of new immigrants to be similar to those who arrived in the 1970s. Research based on cross-section analysis indicates that foreign born persons usually assimilate economically in 10 to 15 years after immigration. Borjas' cohort analysis described in Chapter I, however, challenges this finding. His research shows the process of assimilation has taken much longer for most of the immigrants from developing countries who arrived since the early 1970s and may not take place at all in the first generation. Trends in immigration also show that the greatest flow of immigrants into the United States in the near future will continue to be from developing countries.

The procedures used in the projections do not take into account that some limited English proficient adults may become English proficient over the twenty year period from 1980 to 2000, so the projections may overestimate the number of persons who will need employment training specifically designed for limited English proficient adults. However, given the assumed slow change in English language acquisition for the limited English proficient adults most in need of services and the continuation of immigration from developing countries, the reported estimates may be more accurate than they might have been for earlier limited English proficient adult cohorts.

B. Projections of the Limited English Proficient Adult Population in Need of Employment Training and Related Services

The estimates and projections of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, in need of employment training and related services are presented below. The analysis was done for the three poverty levels described earlier, but the focus is on limited English proficient persons "most at risk," that is below 1.25 times the poverty level, and those "potentially at risk," that is between 1.25 and 1.99 times the poverty level. Data for persons in all three poverty categories are provided in the Appendix C tables. Data from these tables are excerpted and referenced in the text in this chapter.

1. Poverty Status, Sex, and Age (Tables C-1 and C-2)

Twenty-five percent of the limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, are below 1.25 times the poverty level, and 19.2 percent are between 1.25 and 1.99

times the poverty level. Table 4.2 presents the projections for 1990 and 2000. Except for some small variations, close to equal numbers of females and males in both categories are projected for 1990 and 2000.

Well over half of the limited English proficient adult population below 1.99 times the poverty level are expected to be between the ages of 16 and 35. The concentration in the lower age ranges is partly due to the younger age structure of the limited English proficient population and because age is related to income.

Based on findings from the research literature and trends in immigration, however, a larger proportion of limited English proficient population below 1.99 times the poverty level may not have the upward occupational mobility associated with increased age that was demonstrated by earlier immigrants.

TABLE 4.2

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY POVERTY STATUS: 1990 AND 2000

Poverty Status	YEAR 1990	2000
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	3,336,875	4,676,202
1.25 to 1.99 times poverty level	2,209,081	3,338,516
TOTAL	5,545,956	8,014,718

2. **Race/Ethnicity and Spanish Origin** (Table C-3)

The largest number of limited English proficient adults in need of employment training and related services in the future will be Hispanics, as shown in Table 4.3. It is estimated that over 60 percent of limited English proficient Hispanics, ages 16 to 64, below 1.99 times the poverty level will be of Mexican origin. Another 16.5 percent will be Puerto Rican and 17.1 percent will be Other Hispanic. Cubans will comprise only 4.9 percent of the population below 1.99 times the poverty level.

TABLE 4.3

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PERSONS BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND POVERTY STATUS: 1990 AND 2000

	1990		2000	
Race/Ethnicity	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level
Hispanic	2,291,604	1,582,790	3,489,036	2,409,845
Asian	539,484	395,790	918,080	673,544
Black non-Hispanic	87,388	60,455	124,185	85,912
White non-Hispanic	290,636	248,010	338,016	288,440
TOTAL	3,209,112	2,287,045	4,869,317	3,457,741

The number of limited English proficient Asians, ages 16 to 64, below 1.99 times the poverty level is projected to be 1,591,624 by the year 2000. There is expected to be a mix of languages among the Asians in need of services as there is now.

Only a small number of Black non-Hispanics and White non-Hispanics will be in need of assistance, according to the projections. The limited English proficient Black non-Hispanic adults have poverty rates close to those of native born Blacks (about 30 percent), but they will comprise only 2.3 percent of the limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000. White non-Hispanic will be 12.9 percent of the limited English proficient adult population by the year 2000, but they have the lowest 'at risk" rates of the racial/ethnic group at 15.0 percent.

3. **Geographic Distribution** (Table C-4)

Of the four census regions of the United States, the West is expected to have the largest number of limited English proficient adults "at risk" or "potentially at risk" by the year 2000, or an estimated 3.0 million. Most will be persons of Mexican and Asian origin in California. Table 4.4 gives the projections for each region.

TABLE 4.4.

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS
BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION AND POVERTY STATUS: 1990 AND 2000

	1990		2000	
Geographic Region	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level
Northeast	813,872	558,084	1,219,980	836,558
Midwest	290,669	209,281	435,707	313,709
South	903,139	592,964	1,394,262	888,842
West	1,104,540	872,006	1,655,687	1,307,121
TOTAL	3,139,220	2,232,335	4,705,636	3,346,230

The next largest number of limited English proficient persons in need of assistance, close to 2.3 million, will be in the South. A majority of these will be persons of Mexican origin in Texas. Florida will also have large numbers of limited English proficient adults in need of employment training.

About 2.0 million limited English proficient adults below 1.99 times the poverty level will live in the Northeast region by the year 2000, with the greatest concentration in the New York City area. A large percentage will be Puerto Rican, but there will also be persons from the other racial/ethnic populations.

The Midwest is projected to have the fewest limited English proficient adults below 1.99 times the of poverty level by the year 2000. They will number about 750,000 and be concentrated in the Chicago area. A large percentage will be Hispanics.

4. Education (Table C-5)

In Chapter II, it was pointed out that limited English proficient adults have a median educational level of 9.4 years compared to English proficient adults at 12.1 years. Furthermore, educational level is associated with poverty. Table 4.5 shows that a projected 3,[illegible] limited English proficient adults with 11

years of school or less will live below 1.99 times the poverty level by 1990 and this number is estimated to increase to 5,716,476 by the year 2000.

TABLE 4.5

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED AND POVERTY STATUS: 1990 AND 2000

Years of School Completed	1990		2000	
	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level	Below 1.25 Times the Poverty Level	1.25-1.99 Times the Poverty Level
11 years or less	2,278,841	1,534,730	3,415,943	2,300,533
High School Graduate	523,203	441,816	784,273	662,275
One or More Years College	337,176	244,162	505,420	365,994
TOTAL	3,139,220	2,220,708	4,705,636	3,328,802

Given the low educational level of a high percentage of limited English proficient adults, it would appear that many will lack the basic skills required to compete in the future job market. This problem is expected to continue, since many limited English proficient adults will be coming from developing countries or will be school drop-outs in this country.

The better educated limited English proficient adults should be literate in their own language and have other basic skills. Consequently, they should assimilate more readily, depending on the extent to which they have relevant basic skills, and should be able to use written materials to learn a skill.

5. Labor Force Status

Table 4.6 gives the number of limited English proficient males and females who are projected to be unemployed or not in the labor force for 1990 and 2000. As previously reported, the number of hours worked is associated with poverty status and, generally, females work fewer hours than men.

TABLE 4.6

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS UNEMPLOYED OR NOT IN THE LABOR FORCE BY SEX: 1990 AND 2000

	1990		2000	
Labor Force Status	Female	Male	Female	Male
Unemployed	279,855	390,417	410,652	597,144
Not in the Labor Force	2,861,379	839,988	4,198,705	1,284,764

6. Household Type

Table 4.7 gives the number of limited English proficient female household heads projected for 1990 and 2000 by poverty status. If current trends prevail, many of these female headed household will be concentrated in metropolitan areas such as New York City, where 10 percent of the 1,551,571 Spanish origin families are female headed households (U.S. Bureau of the Census, (1983b:473). There may be other areas and other ethnic groups with large numbers as well.

TABLE 4.7

PROJECTED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT FEMALE HEADED HOUSEHOLDS, NO HUSBAND PRESENT, BY POVERTY STATUS: 1990 AND 2000

Poverty Status	1990	2000
Below 1.25 times the poverty level	639,471	958,556
1.25-1.99 times the poverty level	232,535	348,566
TOTAL	872,006	1,307,122

7. Preparation for Workforce 2000

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) projects that there will be 21 million new jobs during 1986-2000. This 18 percent growth rate represents a slowing in growth that began in the late 1970s. The past surge in growth was due to the baby

boomers entering the labor force and an increase in labor force participation rates of women. The projected slowdown is a result of fewer numbers from the "birth dearth" entering the labor market and a slower increase in the number of women entering the labor force (Kutscher, 1987:3).

The BLS estimates that the largest growth will be in occupations requiring at least one year of college. Jobs requiring only a high school education will decline slightly, but there will be a sharp decline in jobs requiring less than a high school education. Blacks and Hispanics are currently over represented in the slow growing occupations (Kutscher, 1987:6).

Immigrants are projected to comprise 23 percent of the increase in the labor force between 1986 and 2000. The extent to which they readily assimilate into the U.S. economy will depend on their English fluency, their job skills, and their geographic location. The fact that immigrants tend to be more geographically concentrated than the general labor force narrows their job search opportunities (Kutscher, 1987:6).

C. Summary

The number of limited English proficient persons, ages 16-64, who could require employment training and related services is projected to be about 5.5 million in 1990 and about 8.0 million in 2000. These numbers are based on trends in immigration and population projections. The numbers do not take into account language assimilation or upward mobility. Consequently, the projections should be considered a "pool" of future limited English proficient persons who may need employment related services.

The above numbers are projections of persons below 1.99 times the poverty level. Of these, the most at risk (those below 1.25 times the poverty level) are projected to be about 3.3 million by 1990 and about 4.7 million by 2000. Persons "potentially at risk" (those between 1.25 and 1.99 times the poverty level) is expected to reach about 2.2 million by 1990 and about 3.3 million by 2000.

REFERENCES

Bean, F.D. (1982). Fertility and Labor Supply Among Hispanic American Women. Unpublished paper. Austin, Texas: Texas University, Population Research Center.

Bernard, W.S. (1953) Economic Effects of Immigration. In Immigration: An American Dilemma. B.M. Ziegler (Ed.). Boston: D.C. Health and Co., pp. 50-70.

Bonacich, E., Light, I., and Wong, C.C. (1980). Korean Immigrant: Small Business in Los Angeles. In Sourcebook on the New Immigration. R.S. Bryce-Laporte (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, pp. 167-184.

Borjas, G.J. (1985). Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants. Journal of Labor Economics, 3 (4), pp. 463-489.

_____ (1987). Self-selection and the Earnings of Immigrants. The American Economic Review, 77(4), pp. 531-553.

_____ (1988). Who Are the Immigrants? Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Santa Barbara.

Bouvier, L.F., & Gardner, R.W. (1986) Immigration to the U.S.: The Unfinished Story, 41 (4). Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Caplan, N., Whitmore, J.K. and Bui, Q.L. (1985). Southeast Asian Refugee Self-Sufficiency Study. Washington, D.C.: Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Chiswick, B.R. (1986). Is the New Immigration Less Skilled Than the Old? Journal of Labor Economics, 4(2), pp.168-192.

Chung, J.S. (1979). Small Ethnic Business as a Form of Disguised Unemployment and Cheap Labor. In Civil Rights Issues of Asian and Pacific Americans: Myths and Realities. Washington, D.C.: A consultation sponsored by the United States Commission on Civil Rights, pp. 508-517.

Committee on the Judiciary. (1988). Immigration Act of 1988 (Senate Report No. 568). Washington, D.C.

Cooney, R.S. and Ortiz, V. (1983). Nativity, National Origin, and Hispanic Female Participation in the Labor Force. Social Science Quarterly, 64 (3), pp. 510-523.

Davis, C., Haub, C., and Willette, J. (1983). U.S. Hispanics: Changing the Face of America. Population Bulletin, 38(3). Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau.

Gottschalk, P. and Danziger, S. (1984). Macroeconomic Conditions, Income. Transfers, and the Trend in Poverty. In The Social Contract Revisited. D.L. Bawden (Ed.). Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, pp. 185-215.

Greenwood, M.J., and McDowell, J.M. (1986). The Factor Market Consequences of U.S. Immigration. Journal of Economic Literature, Vol. XXIV, Dec., pp. 1738-1772.

Grenier, G. (1984). The Effects of Language Characteristics on the Wages of Hispanic-American Males. The Journal of Human Resources, XIX (1), pp. 35-52.

Interstate Migrant Education Council (1987). Migrant Education: A Consolidated View. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States.

Kossoudji, S.A. (1988). English Language Ability and the Labor Market Opportunities of Hispanic and East Asian Immigrant Men. Journal of Labor Economics, 6(2), pp. 205-228.

Kutscher, R.E. (1987). Overview and Implications of the Projections to 2000. In Projections of the Economy, Labor Force, and Occupational Change to the Year 2000. Monthly Labor Review (September). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Light, I. (1979). Disadvantaged Minorities in Self-Employment. International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 20, pp. 31-45.

_____ (1984). Immigrant and Ethnic Enterprise in North America. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 7(2), pp. 195-216.

Maranise, D. (1988). Illegal-Alien Influx: Illusion vs. Reality. Washington Post (April 24) p. A4.

McManus, W., Gould, W., and Welch, F. (1983) Earnings of Hispanic Men: The Role of English Language Proficiency. Journal of Labor Economics, 1,(2), pp. 101-130.

Min, P.G. (1984). From White-Collar Occupations to Small Business: Korean Immigrants' Occupational Adjustment. The Sociological Quarterly, 25 (Summer), pp. 333-352.

The National Center for Health Statistics (1982). Advance Report of Final Natality Statistics, 1980, Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 31, (8). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1983). Births of Hispanic Parentage, 1980, Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 32, (6). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1984). Characteristics of Asian Births, 1980, Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 32, (10). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nguyen, L. and Henkin, A. (1982). Vietnamese Refugees in the United States: Adaptation and Transitional Status. The Journal of Ethnic Studies, 9 (4), pp. 101-116.

Office of Refugee Resettlement. (1987). Report to Congress: Refugee Resettlement Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Passel, J.S. (1986). Immigrations to the United States, Text of speech delivered at Census table, Honolulu, Hawaii (August). Cited by Bouvier and Gardner (1986:38), op. cit.

Portes, A, and Bach, R. (1985). Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States. Berkeley: University of California.

Reimers, C.W. (1984). Sources of Family Income Differentials Among Hispanics Blacks, and White non-Hispanics. American Journal of Sociology, 89 (4), pp. 889-903.

Samuelson, R.J. (1988). In Search of the Middle Class. Washington Post (July 13).

Shryock, H.S., Siegel, J.S. et al. (1973). The Methods and Materials of Demography, Second Printing, (rev.). Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census and U.S. Government Printing Office.

Siegel, P. (1987, October 2 and December 9). [Telephone interview with J.Willette regarding English Language Proficiency Study (ELPS)]. Mr. Siegel is Chief, Education and Social Stratification Branch, U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Tienda, M. (1983). Market Characteristics and Hispanic Earnings: A Comparison of Natives and Immigrants. Social Problems, 31 (1), pp. 59-72.

Topel, R.H. (1988) The Impact of Immigration on the Labor Market. (January 19). Washington, D.C.: Paper published at the NBER Conference on Immigration, Trade, and Labor markets.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1983a). Census of Population and Housing, 1980: Public Use Microdata Samples, Technical Documentation. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____(1983b). General Social and Economic Characteristics, 1980:
New York. PC80-1-C34. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1984). Census of Population and Housing, 1980, Detailed Population Characteristics, United States Summary, PC80-1-D1-A. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1986a). Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1987. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1986b). Projections of the Hispanic Population: 1983 to 2080. Current Population Reports, Population Estimates and Projections, Series P-25, No. 995. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

_____ (1987). English Language Proficiency Study (ELPS): Technical Documentation. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census.

Veltman, C. (1988) The Future of the Spanish Language. New York: Hispanic Policy Development Project.

Willette, J.L., Shaycoft, M.F. and Haub, C.V. (1985). The Sociology of Minority Business Enterprise: An Overview (Report). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency.

Wilson, K.L. & Martin, W.A. (1982). Ethnic Enclaves: A Comparison of the Cuban and Black Economies in Miami. American Journal of Sociology, 88 (1), pp. 135-160.

APPENDIX A

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION - TABLES

TABLE A-1
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY SEX AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Below 1.25	951,300	750,200	1,701,500	9,128,700	5,832,600	14,961,300
Row %	55.9	44.1	100.0	61.0	39.0	100.0
Col %	28.7	25.1	27.0	14.6	10.0	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	630,000	577,400	1,207,400	7,898,200	6,573,700	14,471,900
Row %	52.2	47.8	100.0	54.6	45.4	100.0
Col %	19.0	19.3	19.2	12.6	11.3	12.0
2.00 or more	1,733,500	1,660,200	3,393,700	45,600,300	45,784,700	91,385,000
Row %	51.1	48.9	100.0	49.9	50.1	100.0
Col %	52.3	55.6	53.8	72.8	78.7	75.6
Total	3,314,800	2,987,800	6,302,600	62,627,200	58,191,000	120,818,200
Row %	52.6	47.4	100.0	51.8	48.2	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.
Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-2
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY AGE GROUPS AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient						English Proficient					
	16-24 yrs.	25-34 yrs.	35-44 yrs.	45-54 yrs.	55-64 yrs.	Total	16-24 yrs.	25-34 yrs.	35-44 yrs.	45-54 yrs.	55-64 yrs.	Total
Below 1.25	336,000	535,100	365,000	252,700	212,700	1,701,500	3,566,300	4,373,900	2,468,100	2,005,700	2,547,300	14,961,300
Row %	19.8	31.4	21.5	14.9	12.5	100.0	23.8	29.2	16.5	13.4	17.0	100.0
Col %	35.5	30.6	27.3	20.7	20.3	27.0	18.3	12.4	10.2	9.4	12.4	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	219,200	365,900	255,600	200,300	166,400	1,207,400	3,134,600	4,634,500	2,699,600	1,726,600	2,276,600	14,471,900
Row %	18.2	30.3	21.2	16.6	13.8	100.0	21.7	32.0	18.6	11.9	15.7	100.0
Col %	23.1	21.0	19.1	16.4	15.9	19.2	16.1	13.2	11.1	8.1	11.1	12.0
2.00 or more	392,600	845,100	715,600	769,900	670,500	3,393,700	12,766,900	26,225,300	19,073,900	17,624,200	15,694,700	91,385,000
Row %	11.6	24.9	21.1	22.7	19.8	100.0	14.0	28.7	20.9	19.3	17.2	100.0
Col %	41.4	48.4	53.6	63.0	63.9	53.8	65.6	74.4	78.7	82.5	76.5	75.6
Total	947,800	1,746,100	1,336,200	1,222,900	1,049,600	6,302,600	19,467,800	35,233,700	24,241,600	21,356,500	20,518,600	120,818,200
Row %	15.0	27.7	21.2	19.4	16.7	100.0	16.1	29.2	20.1	17.7	17.0	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-3
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient						English Proficient					
	White non-Hispanic	Black non-Hispanic	Asian	Hispanic	Other non-Hispan.	Total	White non-Hispanic	Black non-Hispanic	Asian	Hispanic	Other non-Hispanic	Total
Below 1.25	258,800	41,600	171,200	1,178,500	51,400	1,701,500	9,886,800	3,951,000	111,200	832,700	179,600	14,961,300
Row %	15.2	2.4	10.1	69.3	3.0	100.0	66.1	26.4	.7	5.6	1.2	100.0
Col %	15.0	30.5	21.4	33.3	48.8	27.0	9.8	29.8	9.3	20.1	23.0	12.4
1.25-1.99	221,400	28,800	126,100	812,000	19,100	1,207,400	11,096,400	2,438,200	107,800	689,700	139,800	14,471,900
Row %	18.3	2.4	10.4	67.3	1.6	100.0	76.7	16.8	.7	4.8	1.0	100.0
Col %	12.8	21.1	15.7	23.0	18.2	19.2	10.9	18.4	9.0	16.6	17.9	12.0
2.00 or more	1,245,000	66,000	504,200	1,543,800	34,700	3,393,700	80,436,300	6,881,300	978,700	2,628,300	460,400	91,385,000
Row %	36.7	1.9	14.9	45.5	1.0	100.0	88.0	7.5	1.1	2.9	.5	100.0
Col %	72.2	48.4	62.9	43.7	33.0	53.8	79.3	51.8	81.7	63.3	59.1	75.6
Total	1,725,200	136,400	801,500	3,534,300	105,200	6,302,600	101,419,500	13,270,500	1,197,700	4,150,700	779,800	120,818,200
Row %	27.3	2.2	12.7	56.1	1.7	100.0	83.9	11.0	1.0	3.4	0.7	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-4
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY SPANISH ORIGIN AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient					English Proficient				
	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Hispanic	Total	Mexican	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Hispanic	Total
Below 1.25	703,700	231,500	49,100	194,200	1,178,500	484,000	156,300	18,600	173,800	832,700
Row %	59.7	19.6	4.2	16.5	100.00	58.1	18.8	2.2	20.9	100.0
Col %	34.5	45.6	16.4	28.2	33.3	20.2	29.2	9.8	16.9	20.1
1.25 to 1.99	521,000	96,800	47,900	146,300	812,000	425,400	91,700	21,800	150,800	689,700
Row %	64.2	11.9	5.9	18.0	100.00	61.6	13.3	3.2	21.9	100.0
Col %	25.5	19.1	16.0	21.3	23.0	17.7	17.2	11.5	14.7	16.6
2.00 or more	814,700	179,400	202,600	347,100	1,543,800	1,489,900	286,800	148,800	702,800	2,628,300
Row %	52.8	11.6	13.1	22.5	100.00	56.7	10.9	5.7	26.7	100.0
Col %	40.0	35.3	67.6	50.5	43.7	62.1	53.6	78.7	68.4	63.3
Total	2,039,400	507,700	299,600	687,600	3,534,300	2,399,300	534,800	189,200	1,027,400	4,150,700
Row %	57.7	14.4	8.5	19.4	100.00	57.8	12.9	4.5	24.8	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

102

TABLE A-5
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY GEORGRAPHICAL REGION AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient					English Proficient				
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Below 1.25	441,800	158,900	503,800	597,000	1,701,500	2,804,300	3,406,400	6,197,200	2,553,400	14,961,300
Row %	26.0	9.3	29.6	35.1	100.0	18.7	22.8	41.4	17.1	100.0
Col %	24.9	20.3	32.0	27.5	27.0	10.8	10.7	15.3	11.3	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	303,100	110,100	320,000	474,200	1,207,400	2,814,100	3,248,100	5,837,300	2,572,400	14,471,900
Row %	25.1	9.1	26.5	39.3	100.0	19.4	22.4	40.3	17.8	100.0
Col %	17.0	14.1	20.3	21.9	19.2	10.8	10.2	14.4	11.4	12.0
2.00 or more	1,032,100	513,300	749,600	1,098,700	3,393,700	20,337,500	25,114,900	28,453,300	17,479,300	91,385,000
Row %	30.4	15.1	22.1	32.4	100.0	22.3	27.5	31.1	19.1	100.0
Col %	58.1	65.6	47.6	50.6	53.8	78.4	79.1	70.3	77.3	75.6
Total	1,777,000	782,300	1,573,400	2,169,900	6,302,600	25,955,900	31,769,400	40,487,800	22,605,100	120,818,200
Row %	28.2	12.4	25.0	34.4	100.0	21.5	26.3	33.5	18.7	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

Table A-6
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY URBAN/NON-URBAN RESIDENCY AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	Urban	Non-urban	Total	Urban	Non-urban	Total
Below 1.25	1,488,800	212,700	1,701,500	10,466,500	4,494,800	14,961,300
Row %	87.5	12.5	100.0	70.0	30.0	100.0
Col %	26.3	33.2	27.0	11.8	13.8	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	1,075,700	131,700	1,207,400	9,802,600	4,669,300	14,471,900
Row %	89.1	10.9	100.0	67.7	32.3	100.0
Col %	19.0	20.6	19.2	11.1	14.4	12.0
2.00 or more	3,098,500	295,200	3,393,700	68,076,100	23,308,900	91,385,000
Row %	91.3	8.7	100.0	74.5	25.5	100.0
Col %	54.7	46.2	53.8	77.1	71.8	75.6
Total	5,663,000	639,600	6,302,600	88,345,200	32,473,000	120,818,200
Row %	89.8	10.2	100.0	73.1	26.9	
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-7
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY YEAR OF IMMIGRATION AND POVERTY STATUS:
1980 CENSUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient								English Proficient							
	Native born	1975-1980	1970-74	1965-69	1960-64	1950-59	Before 1950	Total	Native born	1975-80	1970-74	1965-69	1960-64	1950-59	Before 1950	Total
Below 1.25	687,600	479,400	216,400	134,500	76,700	70,200	36,700	1,701,500	14,332,800	150,500	90,200	85,000	94,100	109,500	99,200	14,961,300
Row %	40.4	28.2	12.7	7.9	4.5	4.1	2.2	100.0	96.0	1.0	.6	.5	.6	.7	.6	100.0
Col %	30.0	35.8	23.2	20.1	18.9	15.2	18.4	27.0	12.4	22.5	13.4	11.4	13.5	9.3	10.7	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	422,400	275,800	207,000	127,600	74,900	69,600	30,100	1,207,400	13,939,100	94,200	90,100	87,400	62,800	114,300	84,000	14,471,900
Row %	35.0	22.8	17.1	10.6	6.2	5.8	2.5	100.0	96.3	.7	.6	.6	.4	.8	.6	100.0
Col %	18.4	20.6	22.2	19.0	18.5	15.1	15.1	19.2	12.0	14.1	13.3	11.8	9.0	9.7	9.0	12.0
2.00 or more	1,184,600	582,900	508,400	408,200	254,200	322,400	133,000	3,393,700	87,651,300	424,300	495,600	570,800	540,800	965,500	745,700	91,385,000
Row %	34.9	17.2	15.0	12.0	7.5	9.5	3.9	100.0	95.9	.5	.5	.6	.6	1.1	.8	100.0
Col %	51.6	43.6	54.6	60.9	62.6	69.7	66.5	53.8	75.6	63.4	73.3	76.8	77.5	81.0	80.3	75.6
Total	2,294,600	1,338.100	931,800	670,300	405,800	462,200	199,800	6,302,600	115,923,200	669,00	675,800	743,200	697,700	1,180,300	928,900	120,818,200
Row %	36.4	21.2	14.8	10.6	6.5	7.3	3.2	100.0	95.9	.5	.6	.6	.6	1.0	.8	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-8
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY CITIZENSHIP STATUS AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	Citizen	Not citizen	Total	Citizen	Not citizen	Total
Below 1.25	892,900	808,600	1,701,500	14,657,300	304,000	14,961,300
Row %	52.5	47.5	100.0	98.0	2.0	100.0
Col %	25.5	28.8	27.0	12.3	15.3	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	615,700	591,700	1,207,400	14,226,800	245,100	14,471,900
Row %	51.0	49.0	100.0	98.3	1.7	100.0
Col %	17.6	21.1	19.2	12.0	12.3	12.0
2.00 or more	1,985,400	1,408,300	3,393,700	89,944,300	1,440,700	91,385,000
Row %	58.5	41.5	100.0	98.4	1.6	100.0
Col %	56.8	50.1	53.8	75.7	72.4	75.6
Total	3,494,000	2,808,600	6,302,600	118,828,400	1,989,800	120,818,200
Row %	55.4	44.6	100.0	98.4	1.6	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-9
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED AND POVERTY STATUS
(16-64*)

Poverty status	Elementary			High school		College			Total
	0-4 yrs.	5-7 yrs.	8 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 or more yrs.	
Limited English Proficient									
Below 1.25	383,900	395,700	160,100	295,500	281,300	102,600	37,800	44,600	1,701,500
Row %	22.6	23.3	9.4	17.4	16.5	6.0	2.2	2.6	100.0
Col %	38.4	32.4	27.0	29.2	20.1	18.0	14.5	18.3	27.0
1.25 to 1.99	231,400	281,200	116,400	203,200	239,700	80,700	29,900	24,900	1,207,400
Row %	19.2	23.3	9.6	16.8	19.8	6.7	2.5	2.1	100.0
Col %	23.2	23.0	19.6	20.0	17.1	14.2	11.4	10.2	19.2
2.00 or more	383,700	543,800	317,000	513,000	881,900	385,800	194,000	174,500	3,393,700
Row %	11.3	16.0	9.3	15.1	26.0	11.4	5.7	5.2	100.0
Col %	38.4	44.6	53.4	50.7	62.8	67.8	74.1	71.5	53.8
Total	999,000	1,220,700	593,500	1,011,700	1,402,900	569,100	261,700	244,000	6,302,600
Row %	15.8	19.4	9.4	16.0	22.3	9.0	4.2	3.9	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
English Proficient									
Below 1.25	672,200	1,233,100	1,388,700	3,963,900	5,092,700	1,653,200	512,000	445,500	14,961,300
Row %	4.5	8.2	9.3	26.5	34.0	11.1	3.4	3.0	100.0
Col %	38.2	31.0	23.8	20.8	10.3	8.0	4.6	4.9	12.4
1.24 to 1.99	375,400	757,100	1,000,500	3,151,500	5,937,500	2,069,800	707,500	472,600	14,471,900
Row %	2.6	5.2	6.9	21.8	41.0	14.3	4.9	3.3	100.0
Col %	21.3	19.0	17.2	16.6	12.1	10.0	6.3	5.2	12.0
2.00 or more	714,300	1,992,900	3,442,900	11,902,600	38,277,400	16,891,400	9,972,200	8,191,300	91,385,000
Row %	.8	2.2	3.8	13.0	41.9	18.5	10.8	9.0	100.0
Col %	40.5	50.0	59.0	62.6	77.6	82.0	89.1	89.9	75.6
Total	1,761,900	3,983,100	5,832,100	19,018,000	49,307,600	20,614,400	11,191,700	9,109,400	120,818,200
Row %	1.5	3.3	4.8	15.7	40.8	17.1	9.3	7.5	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.
Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-10
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	In school	Not in school	Total	In school	Not in school	Total
Below 1.25	70,300	1,631,200	1,701,500	592,800	14,368,500	14,961,300
Row %	4.1	95.9	100.0	4.0	96.0	100.0
Col %	30.4	26.9	27.0	12.4	12.4	12.4
1.25 to 1.99	38,000	1,169,400	1,207,400	491,900	13,980,000	14,471,900
Row %	3.1	96.9	100.0	3.4	96.6	100.0
Col %	16.4	19.3	19.2	10.2	12.0	12.0
2.00 or more	123,100	3,270,600	3,393,700	3,710,000	87,675,000	91,385,000
Row %	3.6	96.4	100.0	4.1	95.9	100.0
Col %	53.2	53.8	53.8	77.4	75.6	75.6
Total	231,400	6,071,200	6,302,600	4,794,700	116,023,500	120,818,200
Row %	3.7	96.3	100.0	4.0	96.0	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-11
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY LABOR FORCE STATUS AND POVERTY STATUS: MALES
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient					English Proficient				
	Employed	Un-employed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Total	Employed	Un-employed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Total
Below 1.24	463,100	69,600	4,300	213,200	750,200	3,242,700	608,600	99,000	1,882,300	5,832,600
Row %	61.7	9.3	.6	28.4	100.0	55.6	10.4	1.7	32.3	100.0
Col %	19.7	35.4	22.6	50.1	25.1	6.7	19.2	12.9	30.8	10.0
1.25 to 1.99	444,500	42,000	6,000	84,900	577,400	4,617,200	531,300	221,100	1,203,800	6,537,700
Row %	77.0	7.3	1.0	14.7	100.0	70.2	8.1	3.4	18.3	100.0
Col %	18.9	21.3	31.6	20.0	19.3	9.6	16.7	28.7	19.7	11.3
2.00 or more	1,439,200	85,200	8,700	127,1001	1,660,200	40,274,700	2,034,000	450,000	3,026,000	45,784,700
Row %	86.7	5.1	.5	7.7	100.0	88.0	4.4	1.0	6.6	100.0
Col %	61.3	43.3	45.8	29.9	55.6	83.7	64.1	58.4	49.5	78.7
Total	2,346,800	196,800	19,000	425,200	2,987,800	48,134,600	3,173,900	770,400	6,112,100	58,191,000
Row %	78.5	6.6	.6	14.2	100.0	82.7	5.5	1.3	10.5	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-12
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY LABOR FORCE STATUS AND POVERTY STATUS: FEMALES
(ages 16-64*)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient					English Proficient				
	Employed	Un-employed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Total	Employed	Un-employed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Total
Below 1.25	249,800	49,400	600	651,500	951,300	3,191,700	603,000	3,900	5,330,100	9,128,700
Row %	26.3	5.2	0.0	68.5	100.0	35.0	6.6	0.0	58.4	100.0
Col %	16.8	30.4	42.9	39.2	28.7	8.9	26.2	4.2	21.9	14.6
1.25 to 1.99	269,300	36,100	300	324,300	630,000	3,963,700	413,100	24,400	3,497,000	7,898,200
Row %	42.7	5.7	0.1	51.5	100.0	50.2	5.2	0.3	44.3	100.0
Col %	18.1	22.2	21.4	19.5	19.0	11.0	17.9	26.1	14.4	12.6
2.00 or more	970,800	76,800	500	684,400	1,733,500	28,738,200	1,286,100	65,200	15,510,800	45,600,300
Row %	56.0	4.4	0.0	39.5	100.0	63.0	2.8	0.1	34.0	100.0
Col %	65.1	47.3	35.7	41.3	52.3	80.1	55.9	69.7	63.7	72.8
Total	1,489,900	162,300	1,400	1,661,200	3,314,800	35,893,600	2,302,200	93,500	24,337,900	62,627,200
Row %	44.9	4.9	0.0	50.1	100.0	57.3	3.7	0.1	38.9	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16-64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-13
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY HOUSEHOLD TYPE* AND POVERTY STATUS
(ages 16-64**)

Poverty status	Limited English Proficient					English Proficient				
	Married couple	Male, no wife	Female, no husband	Non-family	Total	Married couple	Male, no wife	Female, no husband	Non-family	Total
Below 1.25	1,033,200	85,500	344,000	212,300	1,675,000	6,967,400	522,600	3,898,300	3,399,900	14,788,200
Row %	61.7	5.1	20.5	12.7	100.0	47.1	3.5	26.4	23.0	100.0
Col %	22.1	27.6	50.2	36.5	26.7	7.7	16.9	33.5	21.7	12.3
1.25 to 1.99	904,700	60,500	126,500	108,100	1,199,800	9,627,300	409,700	2,210,300	2,185,100	14,432,400
Row %	75.4	5.1	10.5	9.0	100.0	66.7	2.8	15.3	15.2	100.0
Col %	19.3	19.5	18.5	18.6	19.2	10.7	13.3	19.0	14.0	12.0
2.00 or more	2,746,600	163,900	214,100	261,700	3,386,300	73,600,900	2,156,100	5,534,300	10,049,400	91,340,700
Row %	81.1	4.9	6.3	7.7	100.0	80.6	2.4	6.0	11.0	100.0
Col %	58.6	52.9	31.3	44.9	54.1	81.6	69.8	47.5	64.3	75.7
Total	4,684,500	309,900	684,600	582,100	6,261,100	90,195,600	3,088,400	11,642,900	15,634,400	120,561,300
Row %	74.8	5.0	10.9	9.3	100.0	74.8	2.5	9.7	13.0	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Explanation of headings: "Married couple" is a family household headed by a married couple; "male, no wife" means a family with a male householder, no wife present; "female, no husband" means a family with a female householder, no husband present; "non-family" means a household consisting of a person living alone or of unrelated persons living together.

**Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-14
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY FAMILY INCOME
(16-64*)

English Proficiency	Negative or no income	$0,001-5,999	$6,000-9,999	$10,000-14,999	$15,000-24,999	$25,000-49,999	$50,000 and over	Total
Limited	743,000	669,000	755,700	989,500	1,623,700	1,312,700	209,000	6,302,600
Row %	11.8	10.6	12.0	15.7	25.8	20.8	3.3	100.0
Col %	4.3	9.7	8.5	7.0	4.8	3.4	2.8	5.0
English Proficient	16,562,100	6,253,900	8,175,700	13,152,300	31,957,100	37,515,300	7,201,800	120,818,200
Row %	13.7	5.2	6.8	10.9	26.4	31.0	6.0	100.0
Col %	95.7	90.2	91.5	93.0	95.2	96.6	97.2	95.0
Total	17,305,100	6,922,900	8,931,400	14,141,800	35,580,800	38,828,000	7,410,800	127,120,800
Row %	13.6	5.2	7.0	11.1	26.4	30.5	5.8	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons 16 to 64, with persons under 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-15
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY BY EARNED INCOME AND SEX FOR FULL TIME WORKERS
(ages 16-64*)

Earned income**	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Less than $3,999	303,800	342,600	646,400	3,856,700	5,292,400	9,149,100
Row %	47.0	53.0	100.0	42.2	57.8	100.0
Col %	12.9	25.4	17.4	7.7	17.3	11.3
$4,000 - 9,999	778,800	689,000	1,467,800	9,110,100	12,836,300	21,946,400
Row %	53.1	46.9	100.0	41.5	58.5	100.0
Col %	33.1	51.0	39.7	18.2	41.9	27.3
$10,000 - 14,999	568,000	221,800	789,800	10,203,400	7,806,400	18,009,800
Row %	71.9	28.1	100.0	56.7	43.3	100.0
Col %	24.0	16.4	21.3	20.4	25.5	22.3
$15,000 - 24,999	534,200	82,500	616,700	17,097,100	4,094,600	21,191,700
Row %	86.6	13.4	100.0	80.7	19.3	100.0
Col %	24.0	6.1	16.6	34.2	13.3	26.3
$25,000 - 49,999	148,000	11,700	159,700	8,330,700	553,700	8,884,400
Row %	92.7	7.3	100.0	93.8	6.2	100.0
Col %	6.3	.9	4.3	16.7	1.8	11.0
Over $50,000	23,600	3,200	26,800	1,412,100	73,400	1,485,500
Row %	88.1	11.9	100.0	95.1	4.9	100.0
Col %	1.0	.2	.7	2.8	.2	1.8
Total	2,356,400	1,350,800	3,707,200	50,010,100	30,656,800	80,666,900
Row %	63.6	36.4	100.0	62.0	38.0	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

**Earned income includes wages or salaries, and non-farm and farm self-employment income.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-16
ENGLISH PROFICIENCY FOR PERSONS RECEIVING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE INCOME IN 1979 BY SEX
(ages 16-64*)

Sex	Limited English Proficient			English Proficient		
	Receiving Public Assistance	Not Receiving Public Assistance	Total	Receiving Public Assistance	Not Receiving Public Assistance	Total
Male	119,400	2,868,400	2,987,800	1,190,700	57,000,300	58,191,000
Row %	4.0	96.0	100.0	2.0	98.0	100.0
Col %	29.4	48.7	47.4	26.6	49.0	48.2
Female	287,000	3,027,800	3,314,800	3,282,500	59,344,700	62,627,200
Row %	8.7	91.3	100.0	5.2	94.8	100.0
Col %	70.6	51.3	52.6	73.4	51.0	51.8
Total	406,400	5,896,200	6,302,600	4,473,200	116,345,000	120,818,200
Row %	6.5	93.5	100.0	3.7	96.3	100.0
Col %	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Numbers are for persons ages 16 to 64, with persons under age 25 enrolled in school deleted.

Note: Percentages may not total to one-hundred due to rounding.

TABLE A-17
CHARACTERISTICS OF NATIVE-BORN LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULTS
(ages 16-64)

Table 17.1 Geographical Region

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	Total
Number	670,300	299,300	770,000	599,300	2,338,900
Percent	28.7	12.8	32.9	25.6	100.0

Table 17.2 Age

	16-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	Total
Number	401,800	572,200	420,200	462,200	482,500	2,338,900
Percent	17.2	24.5	18.0	19.8	20.6	100.0

Table 17.3 Sex

	Male	Female	Total
Number	1,107,800	1,231,100	2,338,900
Percent	47.4	52.6	100.0

Table 17.4 Years of School Completed

	Elementary			High School		College			
	0-4 yrs.	5-7 yrs.	8 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs.	1-3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 or more yrs.	Total
Number	320,500	357,600	248,900	482,400	582,200	211,200	73,500	62,600	2,338,900
Percent	13.7	15.3	10.6	20.6	24.9	9.0	3.1	2.7	100.0

Table 17.5 Race/Ethnicity

	White non-Hispanic	Black non-Hispanic	Asian	Hispanic	Other non-Hispanic	Total
Number	703,100	78,200	63,000	1,411,500	83,100	2,338,900
Percent	30.1	3.3	2.7	60.3	3.6	100.0

Table 17.6 Spanish Origin

	Mexican	Rican	Cuban	Other Hispanic	Total
Number	798,200	491,100	4,700	117,500	1,411,500
Percent	56.6	34.8	.3	8.3	100.0

Table 17.7 Household Type

	Married couple	Male householder, no wife present	Female householder, no husband present	Non-family household	Total
Number	1,613,400	91,100	342,899	235,300	2,282,700
Percent	70.7	4.0	15.0	10.3	100.0

Table 17.8 Poverty Status

	Below 1.25	1.25-1.99	2.00 and over	Total
Number	687,600	422,400	1,184,600	2,294,600
Percent	30.0	18.4	51.6	100.0

Table 17.9 Labor Force Status

	Employed	Unemployed	Armed Forces	Not in Labor Force	Total
Number	1,293,300	127,000	30,100	888,500	2,338,900
Percent	55.3	5.4	1.3	38.0	100.0

Table 17.10 Total Hours Worked in 1979

	Did not work in 1979	1-629 hrs.	630-1469 hrs.	1470-2309 hrs.	2310-3149 hrs.	Over 3,150 hrs.	Total
Number	845,500	210,600	259,900	832,600	155,400	34,900	2,338,900
Percent	36.1	9.0	11.1	35.6	6.6	1.5	100.0

Table 17.11 Earned Income in 1979

	Less than $3,999	$4,000-9,999	$10,000-14,999	$15,000-24,999	$25,000-49,999	Over $50,000	Total
Number	1,202,400	524,200	292,000	246,600	64,400	9,300	2,338,900
Percent	51.4	22.4	12.5	10.5	2.8	.4	100.0

Table 17.12 Household Income in 1979

	Less than $3,999	$4,000-9,999	$10,000-14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 49,999	Over $50,000	Total
Number	311,500	493,900	394,200	602,300	472,500	64,500	2,338,900
Percent	13.3	21.1	16.9	25.8	20.2	2.7	100.0

APPENDIX B

PROJECTIONS OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT POPULATION - TABLES

TABLE B-1

PROJECTIONS OF TOTAL LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS, AGES 16-64, BY SEX: 1980-2000

TOTAL LIMITED ENGLISH POPULATION, AGES 16-64, 1980-2000

FEMALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	275,600	349,445	503,604	650,190	811,983
20-24	416,600	540,561	622,300	814,859	997,974
25-29	452,000	631,930	748,885	830,577	1,022,968
30-34	438,300	614,191	789,224	906,058	987,707
35-39	359,800	541,717	714,790	889,514	1,006,207
40-44	345,300	431,959	609,246	781,813	956,095
45-49	329,900	400,398	484,413	660,755	832,520
50-54	325,500	372,578	443,692	527,067	701,940
55-59	314,000	361,327	408,595	478,831	561,229
60-64	252,200	338,643	386,587	433,101	502,024
TOTAL	3,509,200	4,582,747	5,711,335	6,972,764	8,380,648

MALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	313,200	390,843	553,047	709,703	855,318
20-24	462,900	638,084	714,491	916,744	1,112,144
25-29	450,000	738,933	895,617	971,925	1,173,680
30-34	399,600	652,697	927,987	1,084,250	1,160,491
35-39	318,600	519,694	764,782	1,039,034	1,194,908
40-44	298,700	397,609	589,839	833,506	1,106,330
45-49	275,100	354,509	447,664	637,912	879,265
50-54	278,000	310,821	388,011	479,604	666,565
55-59	264,700	299,399	330,017	404,829	493,911
60-64	211,300	270,987	303,951	333,799	405,022
TOTAL	3,272,100	4,573,576	5,915,407	7,411,304	9,047,633

GRAND TOTAL	6,781,300	9,156,323	11,626,742	14,384,068	17,428,281

TABLE B-2

PROJECTIONS OF HISPANIC LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS, AGES 16-64, BY SEX: 1980-2000

FEMALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	175,520	230,916	344,226	418,737	510,341
20-24	263,400	338,355	407,606	549,137	642,222
25-29	270,200	386,438	462,117	531,313	672,715
30-34	256,300	352,187	467,057	542,655	611,791
35-39	213,500	304,823	398,903	513,563	589,061
40-44	197,900	246,138	335,546	429,356	543,710
45-49	183,700	222,272	269,021	357,964	451,341
50-54	162,900	200,892	239,005	285,397	373,613
55-59	131,800	175,228	212,539	250,194	296,057
60-64	100,300	139,472	181,536	218,065	255,034
TOTAL	1,955,520	2,596,720	3,317,556	4,096,380	4,945,883

MALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	202,560	257,787	364,608	441,067	537,467
20-24	298,400	414,022	480,380	613,579	708,970
25-29	280,000	475,851	588,415	654,643	787,517
30-34	235,500	393,501	583,531	695,803	761,932
35-39	185,700	294,629	447,693	637,001	748,956
40-44	170,300	222,437	327,047	479,226	667,530
45-49	155,900	194,682	243,891	347,442	498,167
50-54	141,400	170,015	206,890	255,302	357,082
55-59	115,900	148,606	174,934	210,784	257,895
60-64	79,500	117,309	146,750	171,917	206,187
TOTAL	1,865,160	2,688,838	3,564,139	4,506,763	5,531,702

GRAND TOTAL	3,820,680	5,285,558	6,881,695	8,603,143	10,477,585

TABLE B-3

PROJECTIONS OF ASIAN LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS, AGES 16-64, BY SEX: 1980-2000

FEMALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	26,640	62,564	97,052	142,888	189,580
20-24	57,300	94,462	129,183	172,261	229,516
25-29	82,000	127,154	156,616	191,305	234,344
30-34	84,900	143,352	184,606	214,036	248,688
35-39	56,000	127,289	184,225	225,407	254,799
40-44	52,300	84,491	154,969	211,730	252,812
45-49	40,700	74,756	106,317	176,391	232,876
50-54	39,800	61,581	95,953	127,232	196,674
55-59	32,900	60,954	83,744	117,591	148,459
60-64	26,400	51,270	80,562	102,813	135,888
TOTAL	498,940	887,873	1,273,227	1,681,653	2,123,636

MALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	35,360	76,970	113,307	161,661	202,887
20-24	54,100	116,577	152,766	198,073	258,374
25-29	66,600	132,341	179,894	215,988	261,184
30-34	62,000	135,706	191,850	239,268	275,282
35-39	48,200	108,911	178,037	233,975	281,249
40-44	41,100	78,459	136,307	205,027	260,688
45-49	30,100	64,081	99,045	156,282	224,342
50-54	26,000	48,157	81,021	115,339	171,562
55-59	24,200	41,025	62,550	94,297	127,571
60-64	19,000	36,024	52,951	73,265	103,319
TOTAL	406,660	838,250	1,247,729	1,693,175	2,166,456

GRAND TOTAL	905,600	1,726,122	2,520,955	3,374,828	4,290,092

TABLE B-4

PROJECTIONS OF BLACK LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS, AGES 16-64, BY SEX: 1980-2000

FEMALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	11,520	9,657	9,467	10,250	15,696
20-24	13,600	17,339	14,154	13,919	14,899
25-29	13,600	17,989	20,913	17,738	17,507
30-34	11,500	17,641	22,223	25,145	21,983
35-39	7,800	14,403	20,641	25,215	28,137
40-44	7,700	11,625	16,129	22,343	26,908
45-49	6,100	10,242	14,019	18,495	24,674
50-54	4,900	6,581	11,846	15,583	20,021
55-59	5,100	5,172	6,909	12,049	15,684
60-64	4,300	5,033	5,285	6,947	11,874
TOTAL	86,120	115,680	141,586	167,685	197,383

MALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	9,120	8,936	10,722	11,408	15,873
20-24	15,300	14,398	13,192	15,420	16,281
25-29	13,500	20,657	18,834	17,645	19,870
30-34	11,900	18,744	26,591	24,795	23,626
35-39	8,300	15,327	22,782	30,585	28,823
40-44	7,400	12,490	17,277	24,666	32,416
45-49	4,500	10,071	14,811	19,530	26,821
50-54	5,000	4,852	11,394	16,001	20,620
55-59	3,900	4,910	4,832	10,979	15,387
60-64	2,900	3,449	4,495	4,479	10,063
TOTAL	81,820	113,833	144,930	175,509	209,781

GRAND TOTAL	167,940	229,514	286,517	343,194	407,164

TABLE B-5

PROJECTIONS OF WHITE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS, AGES 16-64, BY SEX: 1980-2000

FEMALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	61,920	46,309	52,860	78,316	96,366
20-24	82,300	90,406	71,357	79,542	111,338
25-29	86,200	100,350	109,239	90,222	98,402
30-34	85,600	101,010	115,337	124,222	105,245
35-39	82,500	95,202	111,021	125,329	134,210
40-44	87,400	89,704	102,602	118,384	132,665
45-49	99,400	93,128	95,056	107,905	123,629
50-54	117,900	103,523	96,888	98,856	111,632
55-59	144,200	119,974	105,403	98,997	101,031
60-64	121,200	142,869	119,204	105,276	99,229
TOTAL	968,620	982,474	978,966	1,027,047	1,113,747

MALES

AGE	1980	1985	1990	1995	2000
16-19	66,160	47,150	64,409	95,567	99,090
20-24	95,100	93,087	68,154	89,672	128,519
25-29	89,900	110,085	108,473	83,649	105,109
30-34	90,200	104,746	126,016	124,384	99,651
35-39	76,400	100,827	116,271	137,473	135,880
40-44	79,900	84,223	109,208	124,587	145,696
45-49	84,600	85,676	89,917	114,659	129,936
50-54	105,600	87,798	88,705	92,962	117,300
55-59	120,700	104,858	87,701	88,769	93,059
60-64	109,900	114,205	99,755	84,138	85,454
TOTAL	918,460	932,655	958,609	1,035,857	1,139,694

GRAND TOTAL	1,887,080	1,915,129	1,937,575	2,062,904	2,253,440

APPENDIX C

PROJECTIONS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT ADULT BY POVERTY STATUS: 1980, 1990, and 2000 - TABLES

TABLE C-1
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS BY SEX AND POVERTY STATUS: 1980, 1990, AND 2000
(ages 16-64)

Sex	Poverty status									Total		
	Below 1.25 of poverty			1.25 to 1.99 of poverty			2.00 or more of poverty					
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
Female	1,007,140	1,639,153	2,405,246	666,748	1,085,154	1,592,323	1,835,312	2,987,028	4,383,079	3,509,200	5,711,335	8,380,648
Male	821,297	1,697,722	2,270,956	631,515	1,123,927	1,746,193	1,819,288	3,093,758	5,030,484	3,272,100	5,915,407	9,047,633
Total	1,828,437	3,336,875	4,676,202	1,298,263	2,209,081	3,338,516	3,654,600	6,080,786	9,413,563	6,781,300	11,626,742	17,428,281

TABLE C-2
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS BY AGE GROUP AND POVERTY STATUS: 1980,1990, AND 2000
(ages 16-64)

Age Group	Poverty status									Total		
	Below 1.25 of poverty			1.25 to 1.99 of poverty			2.00 or more of poverty					
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
16-24 years	521,247	849,672	1,340,984	339,177	552,885	872,584	607,876	990,885	1,563,851	1,468,300	2,393,442	3,777,419
25-34 years	532,409	1,028,684	1,329,523	365,379	705,960	912,418	842,112	1,627,069	2,102,905	1,739,900	3,361,713	4,344,846
35-44 years	361,015	731,273	1,163,946	252,579	511,624	814,336	708,806	1,435,760	2,285,258	1,322,400	2,678,657	4,263,540
45-54 years	248,951	363,339	634,539	198,194	289,260	505,168	761,355	1,111,181	1,940,583	1,208,500	1,763,780	3,080,290
55-64 years	211,566	290,117	398,324	165,710	227,235	310,025	664,924	911,798	1,253,837	1,042,200	1,429,150	1,962,186
Total	1,875,188	3,263,085	4,867,316	1,321,039	2,286,964	3,414,531	3,585,073	6,076,693	9,146,434	6,781,300	11,626,742	17,428,281

TABLE C-5
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS
BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND POVERTY STATUS: 1980, 1990, AND 2000
(ages 16-64)

Race/ethnicity	Poverty status									Total		
	Below 1.25 of poverty			1.25-1.99 of poverty			2.00 or more of poverty					
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
Hispanic	1,272,287	2,291,604	3,489,036	878,756	1,582,790	2,409,845	1,669,637	3,007,301	4,578,704	3,820,680	6,881,695	10,477,585
Asian	193,799	539,484	918,080	142,179	395,790	673,544	569,622	1,585,681	2,698,468	905,600	2,520,955	4,290,092
Black non-Hispanic	51,222	87,388	124,185	35,435	60,455	85,912	81,283	138,674	197,067	167,940	286,517	407,164
White non-Hispanic	283,062	290,636	338,016	241,546	248,010	288,440	1,362,472	1,398,929	1,626,984	1,887,080	1,937,575	2,253,440
Total	1,800,370	3,209,112	4,869,317	1,297,916	2,287,045	3,457,741	3,683,014	6,130,585	9,101,223	6,781,300	11,626,742	17,428,281

TABLE C-4
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROF PERSONS
BY GEOGRAPHIC REGION AND POVERTY STATUS: 1990, AND 2000
(ages 16-64)

Geographic Region	Poverty status									Total		
	Below 1.25 of poverty			1.25 - 1.99 of poverty			00 or more of poverty					
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	80	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
Northeast	474,691	813,872	1,219,980	325,502	558,084	836,558	,133	1,906,786	2,858,238	1,912,326	3,278,742	4,914,776
Midwest	169,533	290,669	435,707	122,063	209,281	313,709	,285	941,766	1,411,691	840,881	1,441,716	2,161,107
South	542,504	930,139	1,394,262	345,846	592,964	888,842	,975	1,383,582	2,073,965	1,695,325	2,906,685	4,357,069
West	644,224	1,104,540	1,655,687	508,598	872,006	1,307,121	,946	2,023,053	3,032,521	2,332,768	3,999,599	5,995,329
Total	1,830,952	3,139,220	4,705,636	1,302,009	2,232,335	3,346,230	,339	6,255,187	9,376,415	6,781,300	11,626,742	17,428,281

TABLE C-5
ESTIMATED NUMBER OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT PERSONS
BY YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED: 1980, 1990, AND 2000
(ages 16-64)

Year of school Completed	Poverty status									Total		
	Below 1.25 of poverty			1.25 to 1.99 of poverty			2.00 or more of poverty					
	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000	1980	1990	2000
11 years or less	1,329,135	2,278,841	3,415,943	895,132	1,534,730	2,300,533	1,391,983	3,243,861	4,862,490	4,116,250	7,057,432	10,578,966
High school graduate	305,158	523,203	784,273	257,698	441,816	662,275	949,382	1,627,744	2,439,959	1,512,229	2,592,763	3,886,507
One or more years of college	196,658	337,176	505,420	142,407	244,162	365,994	813,756	1,395,209	2,091,394	1,152,821	1,976,547	2,962,808
Total	1,830,951	3,139,220	4,705,636	1,295,228	2,220,708	3,328,802	3,655,121	6,266,814	9,393,843	6,781,300	11,626,742	17,428,281